

Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, APRIL 17, 1880.

CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS:—	
Order of Transfer	457
Judges' Chambers	457
Certificates of Search for Judgments, &c.	457
Bills of Sale	457
Can a Jew hold the Office of Lord Chancellor? ..	457
Causes standing out of the Paper	458
The Newcastle Law Society	458
Law Officers in the New Administration	458
READERS:—	
Liability of Company in respect of Registration of Transferees of Shares or Stock	458
Injunctions to Restrain Statements as to Former Employment ..	461
Lawyers in Parliament	461
GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE:—	
N. W. CARRER, & CO.	461
CASES OF THE WEEK:—	
London Joint Stock Bank, The, v. The Mayor and Aldermen of London	463
Lawrie v. Lees	464
Thompson, In re	464
Kinlock v. The Secretary of State for India in Council	464
Fife, Re	464
Dronfield Silketone Coal Company (Limited), In re	465
Robins v. Macleau	465
Rees v. The Metropolitan Board of Works	465
Waller v. Tanguery	465
OBITUARY:—	
APPOINTMENTS, ETC.	466
COMPANIES:—	
SOCIETIES:—	
LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL:—	
CREDITORS' CLAIMS:—	
COURT PAPERS:—	
LONDON GAZETTES, &C., &C.:—	

CASES REPORTED IN THE WEEKLY REPORTER.

Ashenden v. London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Ex.Div.)	511
Attorney-General v. London and North-Western Railway Company (Ex.Div.)	515
Bank of Whitehaven, Ex parte. In re Bowes (Bkey.)	523
Barber, Ex parte. In re Anslow (Bkey.)	522
Blewitt, In the Goods of (Prob.Div.)	520
Cox v. Willoughby (Ch.Div. Fry, J.)	508
Debenham v. Mellor (App.)	501
Duce, Ex parte. In re Whitehouse (App.)	501
Evans, Ex parte. In re Baum (App.)	506
Goldstraw, App't. v. Duckworth and another, Rept. (Q.B.Div.) ..	504
Hooper and another v. Bourne and others (H.L.)	493
Jenner v. Finch and another (Prob.Div.)	520
London and South-Western Bank v. Wentworth (Ex.Div.)	516
Metcalfe, In re. Hicks v. May (App.)	496
Metropolitan Inner Circle Completion Company, The, v. The Metropolitan Railway and another (Ex.Div.)	510
Morrison, Ex parte. In re Westray (Bkey.)	524
Queen, The, v. Stewart (Q.B.Div.)	506
Spaight and others v. Farnworth and another (Q.B.Div.)	508
Von Heyden v. Neustadt (App.)	495
Yorkshire Wagon Company, The, v. The Newport and Abercrombie Coal Company (Q.B.Div.)	505

CURRENT TOPICS.

AN ORDER OF TRANSFER of forty causes will shortly be made. Ten of these causes are taken from the list of the Master of the Rolls, ten from the list of Vice-Chancellor Malins, and twenty from the list of Vice-Chancellor Hall. These causes will be transferred to Vice-Chancellor Bacon, and, by the same order, re-transferred to Mr. Justice Fry for the purpose of trial or hearing only.

THE JUDGES' CHAMBERS in the Royal Courts of Justice will be opened on Monday next, when the judge and masters will sit for the hearing of summonses in the new building. Masters' summonses will in future be heard by separate masters according to alphabetical divisions, and summonses will be issued and orders drawn up accordingly. Solicitors and their clerks attending summonses are requested to meet in the room No. 81 on the ground-floor. The bar-room is No. 100 on the court-floor.

WE PUBLISH elsewhere a well-timed letter from the Chief Clerk of the Registry of Judgments, explaining the

arrangements which have been made under the new rules for giving certificates of search for judgments, &c. The first step is to send in a requisition for search upon a form which is supplied gratuitously on application at the office. A separate requisition is necessary for each name to be searched for. The requisition must be sent in some days before the certificate of result of search is required, and it is so framed that a search can be directed to be made up to two o'clock on the day up to which search is requested to be made. Under No. 48 of the new rules (ord. 60a, r. 8) no judgment can now be received for registration after the hour of two in the afternoon; the new provision as to certificate of search will, therefore, enable a purchase to be completed in the afternoon of the day up to which search is requested in absolute safety as regards judgments, &c. The fee for the official certificate of search has not yet been settled.

WE REFERRED last week to the probable effect of the last clause of No. 48 of the new rules—which provides that "a person shall not inspect nor take any extract from any of these registers or indexes [including the register of bills of sale], or any document filed in connection therewith, until he has specified in writing to the officer in charge of the register or index the name against which he wishes to search, and has satisfied the officer as to the object of the search"—in stopping the private enterprise so long carried on of publishing a list of the names of persons giving bills of sale. There have since been addressed to the authorities very energetic remonstrances from the persons and societies affected by this provision, and we believe we are correct in saying that hitherto no attempt has been made to enforce the rule. We have reason to believe that the rule was framed with the deliberate object of putting a stop to what, under the changed state of the law since the Bills of Sale Act, 1878, is nothing short of an injustice—viz., the publication of the name of every one who gives an instrument which has to be registered under that Act. The result of this is, that the names of persons of perfect solvency and respectability are published side by side with the names of the money-lenders' victims. We see no reason for the hesitation which appears to exist as to bringing the new rule into operation; and we hope that pressure will be applied by the law societies to counter-balance the efforts of the "trade protection societies."

THE QUESTION whether a Jew can hold the office of Lord Chancellor may, some of these days, become a practical one, and it is worth while to inquire into the nature of the supposed obstacles. So far as we know, there is no enactment in the statute-book which, expressly and in terms, disqualifies a Jew from holding this office. The oath formerly taken by the Chancellor, "on the true faith of a Christian" was, of course, an effectual bar, but these words were omitted from the form of oath prescribed by the "Office and Oath Act, 1867," and there is now nothing in the nature of the Chancellor's oath to exclude a Jew from the office. Lord Coleridge, when Attorney-General, referring to this question, went so far as to say that "a Jew could hold any office, either in England or Ireland." But we apprehend that in saying this, the learned speaker overlooked the fact that a disqualification may exist at common law, without the existence of any disabling statute; and this, we submit, is the case with Jews as regards the office of Chancellor. It is clear that the Legislature thought that this was so when the Act enabling Jews to sit in Parliament was passed; for by that statute (21 & 22 Vict. c. 49, s. 3) it was expressly provided that "nothing herein contained shall extend, or be construed to extend, to enable any person professing the Jewish religion to hold the office of [*inter alia*] Lord High Chancellor." An enabling statute, we apprehend, would be necessary to enable a

Jew to become Lord Chancellor of England, and for such a statute a precedent might be found in the Act of 21 & 22 Vict. c. 49, already referred to, by section 1 of which all the Queen's subjects, without reference to their religious belief, were made eligible to hold the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland; by section 2, provision was made for the ecclesiastical patronage in cases where the Chancellor was not a member of the Established Church, and, by section 3 the exercise of certain other functions of an ecclesiastical character was provided for.

ALTHOUGH THE CAUSE LISTS in the Chancery Division are so heavy, it would appear that many of the causes contained in those lists, are, from one reason or another, not ready for hearing. This, we conclude, is due to the practice so often resorted to of setting down a cause in the book as soon as ever the rules permit, without regard to the fact that the witnesses are not ready, so that briefs cannot be delivered. This unreadiness necessitates a consent on both sides to the cause standing out of the paper, and it is matter of daily experience, that causes already in the day's paper, or apparently ready to be in the next day's paper, are suddenly found to have been marked by consent to stand out of the paper for a considerable period. To so great an extent is this carried, that Mr. Justice Fry, who has a large list of causes, is, on account of so many of them standing out by consent, compelled to ask for a transfer to him of forty causes. The Master of the Rolls' list is in a very similar condition, and the difficulty is aggravated by his having to part with some of his causes to Mr. Justice Fry. On Tuesday last his lordship got through his paper, which was very short, by two o'clock, and there was some difficulty in compiling a paper for Thursday, although the list contains a large number of causes. A remedy for the inconvenience experienced by reason of causes being marked by consent of parties to stand out of the paper might be found if a regulation were made that causes once set down in the book should not be marked to stand out without special leave of the court, or, in the alternative, that causes so marked should, *ipso facto*, lose their place in the list, and on being restored, should go to the bottom. The object in setting down causes at the earliest possible date is to obtain a place in the list, and then by marking a cause to stand over it gradually comes to the top of the list and will come into the paper immediately on being restored. If some such rule as we suggest were adopted, causes would not be set down until they were ready to be heard, and the chancery judges would not so often be in the position of the ancient mariner, with "water, water everywhere, but not a drop to drink."

WE ARE GLAD to find that a vigorous effort is being made by the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Law Society to meet the wants of articled clerks in preparing for the intermediate examination. There have been established, under the auspices of the society, classes meeting once or twice a week for reading and illustrating the books presented for that examination. These, we believe, are the first classes of the kind which have been established by any provincial law society, and we heartily hope the effort may be successful.

IT WOULD BE ABSURD to attempt to predict the course of events as regards the forthcoming occupants of legal offices; but it may be noticed that rumour already asserts that Mr. Herschell, Q.C., will be Solicitor-General, and Mr. Osborne Morgan, Q.C., Judge Advocate General in the new Administration.

Mr. Justice Bowen will preside at the forty-eighth anniversary festival of the United Law Clerks' Society, which will take place on Monday, June 7, at the Freemasons' Tavern.

LIABILITY OF COMPANY IN RESPECT OF REGISTRATION OF TRANSFEREE OF SHARES OR STOCK.

THE case of *Sinn v. The Anglo-American Telegraph Company* (28 W. R. 290, L. R. 5 Q. B. D. 188), recently decided in the Court of Appeal, raised a point of great importance to companies and their shareholders. The question which arose was as to the liabilities of a company receiving a transfer of shares or stock in respect of the registration of the transferee. The facts appear to have been briefly as follows:—The clerk of a shareholder in a company contracted with B. & Co. to sell £5,000 stock in the company. He subsequently forged his masters' signature to a deed purporting to transfer that amount of stock to the nominees of B. & Co., who then, acting on behalf of B. & Co., presented the transfer to the company for registration. The company sent a letter to the shareholder inquiring whether the transfer was correct, but this being intercepted by the clerk was not answered, and the company thereupon registered the transfer to the nominees of B. & Co. Before, however, a certificate was issued to them, they, at the request of B. & Co., transferred the stock to the plaintiffs, who were registered by the company as transferees thereof, and in due course received certificates of registration. The plaintiffs were the trustees of a bank, and the arrangement was that they should hold the stock as trustees for B. & Co., subject to any charge the bank might have upon it, the intention being that the bank should make advances to B. & Co. upon the security of the stock. Certain advances were then made by the bank to B. & Co., but they were subsequently paid off, and the plaintiffs became bare trustees of the stock for B. & Co. The forgery being afterwards discovered, the company refused to recognize the plaintiffs as the owners of the stock. The action appears to have been in form for wrongfully representing that certain persons were registered holders of stock in the defendants' company, and as such had title to transfer and sell the same, and also for the recovery of the purchase-money of the stock and the dividends thereon. A second action was brought by the company against the nominees of B. & Co. for an indemnity. The actions were tried together before Lindley, J., and it was agreed that B. & Co. should be added as plaintiffs in the first action, and as defendants in the second. Upon these facts Lindley, J., held that the plaintiffs—that is to say, in reality B. & Co.—were entitled to recover the value of the stock from the company. This decision was reversed by the Court of Appeal.

We cannot quite understand the line of argument adopted by Lindley, J., in the first part of his judgment as reported. He seems, to some extent, to rely on the fact that the original plaintiffs, the trustees of the bank, had a good title to the shares by estoppel against the company. This was, no doubt, the case at one time, because the company had held out to them that the nominees of B. & Co. were the owners of the shares, and they had altered their position on the faith of such ownership. But it seems to us that this was immaterial, because, in reality, B. & Co. were the plaintiffs. The estoppel in favour of the original plaintiffs, the trustees of the bank, arose out of their advances on the faith of the representation that the nominees of B. & Co. were owners of the shares. Those advances had been paid off. As Brett, L.J., put it, when the advances were paid off, the trustees of the bank could not have recovered in respect of any estoppel in their favour; consequently they could not transmit a right of action to B. & Co. It is true that Lindley, J., does advert to the argument that the repayment of the advances made the trustees of the bank mere trustees for B. & Co., and consequently left them with no further title to the shares than B. & Co., and says that he will deal with that argument subsequently; but in the latter part of his judgment, which relates to the second action, he seems to treat the case

entirely as between B. & Co. and the company, and puts it wholly on the broader ground that, as between themselves and an innocent transferee, it is the duty of the company to ascertain the validity of the transfer. It seems to us, therefore, that the trustees for the bank, and the facts of the case relating to their part in the transaction, may be dismissed altogether from consideration.

The case then simply resolves itself into one between a company and the innocent transferee under a forged transfer. Lindley, J., considered that it was the duty of the company in keeping their register to see that it was correct, and for that purpose to make the necessary inquiries, and satisfy themselves as to the validity of the transfer. He says that B. & Co. were entitled to say, "We did not deceive you; you made inquiries, and you accepted us as shareholders, and put us on the register, and you cannot now turn round and say that as between you and us we do not hold the position which you have led us to believe that that we are entitled to." But the question immediately occurs to the mind, assuming that there is a duty on the company to make the inquiry, What is the consequence of a breach of such duty? Can it be that the innocent transferee is entitled to recover the value of the shares unless he has suffered the loss of that value through the company's breach of duty? This would depend on whether he parted with the purchase-money of the shares on the faith of the company's registration of him as shareholder. But we take it that he parts with his money as the consideration-money for the execution of the transfer. The registration or non-registration of the transfer by the company is matter altogether subsequent, and his position cannot be thereby prejudiced. Therefore, even assuming that there was in some sense a duty on the part of the company to see that their register was correct, it is difficult to see how there is any damage enabling the transferee to bring an action for the breach of such duty. It might, however, be contended that, the company's conduct entitling the innocent transferee to consider himself the holder of the shares, he is prevented from promptly pursuing any remedy he might have against the party selling to him as he might do if he knew that he had not obtained what he had bargained for, and, therefore, that the company ought, at any rate if it can be shown that the transferee was prejudiced, to be responsible to him for the value of the shares. But assuming that there is some duty on the part of the company, what, at the utmost, can that duty be? Surely only to use due care in reference to the entries made in their register. The view taken by Lindley, J., seems to go to the length of holding that they are absolutely bound to have their register correct. But what ground is there for this extreme view of their responsibility? In the case we are discussing they took the usual precaution of writing to the transferor, but the letter never reached him. We do not see what further precaution, in reason, they could be expected to take if the question is one of negligence.

The Court of Appeal, indeed, appear to have been of opinion that there was no duty cast on the company to make inquiry as to the genuineness of the transfer at all. It was said that the company, having registered the forged transfer, were estopped from afterwards denying the title of the transferees. But whence can such an estoppel arise unless there is an absolute duty thrown on the company, when a transfer is presented to them, to determine whether the person presenting it is the true owner of the shares, and they are bound by the determination they then make? Otherwise it is merely this case. I have certain goods in my possession which I believe to belong to A. B. comes and claims them either as assignee of A. or otherwise, *bona fide* believing them to be his. I write to B. a letter acknowledging his title to the goods and promising to give them up to him. I ascertain from information subsequently received that the goods are indisputably A.'s, and that B. has no right to them. I then refuse to give them up to B. Surely he would

have no right of action against me. An estoppel of this kind depends (as was pointed out by the judges in the Court of Appeal) upon a representation made by the party estopped upon the faith of which the other party has altered his position. Here there was, in truth, no representation at all made to the transferee by the company. The representation was the other way. The transferee brings to the company a document which he alleges to be a transfer of the stock from the true owner. The company, on the faith of that transfer, registers the transferee, but they do not make any representation to him. Apart from the question of any duty thrown on the company, it is obvious that there can be no estoppel. It would seem that there can only be such a duty as must be contended for on the transferee's behalf if some statutory enactment, either expressly or impliedly, makes it the duty of the company upon the transfer being presented to them to determine the title to the shares, and makes such determination conclusive as against them, if they determine in favour of the transferee. No section of any statute was cited showing that there was such a duty cast upon the company. It may possibly be contended that, having regard to the exigencies of business, it would be desirable that the company should be placed in this position. We believe a good many business men are dissatisfied with the judgment of the Court of Appeal and prefer the conclusion at which Lindley, J., arrived; but, if so, it seems to us that the desired effect must be produced by future enactment, and that the alleged duty cannot arise under any common law doctrine of estoppel.

Various questions arise upon the facts of the case we are discussing which, though not immediately material to the decision, have considerable theoretical interest. It has always seemed to us difficult, in those cases where the question is which of two innocent parties is to suffer for a fraud or criminal act perpetrated by a third party, to determine how far the principle is applicable that of such parties he shall suffer who has enabled the fraud or criminal act to be committed. It does not appear in this case how the certificates for the stock came into the hands of the clerk. It is, we take it, on the production of those certificates that the company acts in giving effect to the transfer. If the original shareholder intrusted those certificates to the clerk, he certainly enabled the fraud to be committed; but yet we cannot think that the original shareholder would be liable in any way to any person in consequence of the fraudulent act of his clerk. It is not negligence to intrust such certificates to a clerk. Persons are not bound, under all circumstances, to suspect others of the intention to defraud. Business could not be carried on if they were. It would be a long step towards reducing stock to the same position as bonds payable to bearer to hold that the holder cannot part with the certificates from his possession to any person without running this risk. The tendency of mercantile men is ever in the direction of the negotiability of instruments, and towards making the title to anything depend on the possession of the usual *indicia* of title, as, for instance, is enacted by the Factors Acts with regard to particular matters. But it seems to us that, after all, there is something besides mercantile convenience to be considered in the world. It would be a very dangerous and sweeping doctrine to hold that a man is to forfeit his property because he has allowed it to leave his possession, and another person has been deceived with regard to the title to it and has innocently purchased it.

On Monday, in the Exchequer Division, on Mr. Baron Huddleston taking his seat on the bench for the first time after an absence of some months, Mr. Watkins Williams, Q.C., the senior Queen's Counsel present in court, rose and congratulated his lordship and the public on his return to the bench in restored health. The learned baron feelingly acknowledged the compliment, and said he hoped to complete on the Bench that convalescence which was already far advanced.

INJUNCTIONS TO RESTRAIN STATEMENTS AS TO FORMER EMPLOYMENT.

II.

WE come now to the important case generally cited in questions of this nature, and from the judgment in which some extracts have been already given—*Glenny v. Smith* (2 Drew. & Sm. 476). One of the *employés* of Thresher, Glenny, & Co., of the Strand, having left their service and opened a shop in Oxford-street, placed his own name over the door, but put on the awning and on the door-plates the words, "From Thresher & Glenny." The word "from" was in very small letters, so as not to be likely to attract the attention of customers, and on the whole case the learned judge came to the conclusion that deception was probable, and that an injunction must be granted. The fact that the defendant had cautioned one of his shopmen not to permit customers to buy under the impression that they were buying from Thresher & Glenny, so far from being regarded as favourable to the defendant, was held to be against him, as showing that he had contemplated the possibility of deception by the use he was making of his old employers' name.

Very similar to *Glenny v. Smith* was the American case of *Colton v. Thomas* (7 Phila. 257), in which a person who had been in the employ of "The Colton Dental Association" set up in business on his own account as a dentist, and began to describe himself as "Dr. F. R. Thomas, late operator at the Colton Dental Rooms." The words "late operator at the" were in very small letters, so that the distinction between ex-employer and ex-*employé* was practically obliterated, and an injunction was the inevitable result.

Williams v. Osborne (13 L. T. N. S. 498) was another case before Lord Hatherley, in which he held that former servants of R. Hendrie, a perfumer, were entitled to place on their shop, established after his death, the words "from the late R. Hendrie," and to style themselves on placards "managers and manufacturers to the late R. Hendrie," and to use Hendrie's name on their labels in conjunction with their own, if there were no unfair or untrue statements made; but his lordship pointed out that a certain course of conduct which was begun with no fraudulent intention would be continued with such an intention if no change were made after it had been pointed out that the public were deceived.

In *Labouchere v. Dawson* (L. R. 13 Eq. 322), the defendant was one of the vendors of a brewery business, who, after the sale, set up in business elsewhere, and endeavoured to draw away to his new business the old customers of the business he had sold. The same principle as that followed in *Burrows v. Foster* was adopted, and Lord Romilly held that, while the defendant was entitled to publicly advertise his business, he was not justified in seeking to destroy the value of the business he had sold by drawing away the customers to his new one.

Another of the better-known cases is *Hookham v. Pottage* (21 W. R. 47), which came before the Lords Justices of Appeal in Chancery. There, after the firm of "Hookham & E. & S. Pottage" had been dissolved, and the last two partners paid out, so that the business was retained by the senior partner, who began to trade as "Hookham & Co." S. Pottage set up near him, and placed over his shop the words "S. Pottage, from Hookham & Pottage," and as in *Foot v. Lea*, *Glenny v. Smith*, and *Colton v. Thomas*, the words denoting the relation between the old business and the new one—i.e., "from" and "and"—were in small letters. It was held that the defendant had acted so as to divert to himself custom intended for the plaintiff, and that an injunction must be granted, though, if he had confined himself to a fair statement of his connection with the old firm, he could not have been interfered with.

The plaintiff in *Robineau v. Charbonnel* (V. C. M., May 4, 1876) was a Parisian confectioner, trading at the

"Maison Boissier," and the defendants were persons who, after having been in his service, came over to London and opened a shop in Bond-street, and placed in the window the words "Ex 1ères de la Maison Boissier de Paris." The plaintiff having no shop in England, no injury could be done him by the defendants' conduct, and no injunction could be granted, but the words "Ex 1ères de la" were in very small letters, and the Vice-Chancellor was of opinion that, on the whole, the conduct of the defendants had not been such as to entitle them to their costs, and no order in that respect was made.

In *Dence v. Mason* (V. C. M., Feb. 12, 1878), the Vice-Chancellor held that a former servant of Messrs. Brand & Co. would not have been entitled to represent himself as the original maker of the essence of beef manufactured by that firm, even if he had been the first to discover the recipe, since whatever essence of beef he had prepared had been made by him in the plaintiff's service; but his lordship held that the defendant was at liberty to state fairly that he had been in the plaintiff's service, and that he had become acquainted with the recipe during that period.

In *Selby v. Anchor Tube Company* (V. C. B., July 19, 1877) the parties had been in partnership as tube manufacturers, carrying on business at Birmingham as "The Imperial Iron Tube Company," and at Smethwick as "The Birmingham Patent Iron and Brass Tube Company." The partnership was dissolved, and the plaintiff thereupon became entitled, under the partnership deed, to the premises at Smethwick and to the styles and goodwill of the firm, and the defendants became entitled to the Birmingham premises. The plaintiff then carried on business alone at Smethwick and also at new works at Birmingham as "The Imperial Iron Tube Company," and the defendants, carrying on business at the old premises in Birmingham, began to put out circulars headed "The Anchor Tube Company (late) the Works of and Partners and Manager in the Imperial Iron Tube Company, Gas-street, Birmingham," and to solicit the customers of the old firm. This was held to be an interference with the plaintiff's rights, and an injunction was granted.

The last case to which attention need be directed is that of *Fullwood v. Fullwood* (26 W. R. 435), where the plaintiff was carrying on at Somerset-place, Hoxton, an annatto business, established, under the name of "R. J. Fullwood & Co.," in 1785, and the defendants, one of whom had formerly been the plaintiff's partner, but had sold his interest to the plaintiff, began to carry on a similar business under the name of "E. Fullwood & Co.," and to describe themselves in advertisements as "late of Somerset-place, Hoxton, Original Manufacturers of Liquid and Cake Annatto," and to state that their business had been "established in 1785." Mr. Justice Fry held that the course taken by the defendants would probably have the result of causing their business to be mistaken for the plaintiff's, and he granted an injunction, notwithstanding that the plaintiff had delayed commencing his action for a year and a half after he became aware of the defendants' conduct, since the period fixed by the Statute of Limitations had not expired before the action was brought, which was intended to assert a legal right.

From a comparison of these cases it will be seen that the principles to which we adverted at the outset are well established in practice. Although the circumstances under which those principles have had to be applied have varied in very many particulars, effect has nevertheless been given to those principles, and while a fair use has been allowed to be made of the fact of former employment, fraudulent servants have not been allowed to appropriate their masters' business by the skillful manipulation of that fact. There is no need to establish a fraudulent intention; if the defendant has acted so as to bring about the consequences of fraud, it is sufficient, and there is no necessity to inquire further into motives.

In examining the circumstances of each case, however, the motives by which the defendant has been actuated will generally be discussed, and it is impossible not to notice in how many cases differences of type have been held to weigh heavily against defendants. No doubt a retired servant is entitled to use his late master's name for the purpose of informing the public that he comes before them recommended by the fact of having been employed in an establishment of admitted reputation, but when he places that name on his door or over his window, he is bound to take special care not to let it be supposed that the name is there placed as being that of the proprietor of the shop. The safest plan in such cases would evidently be to give such words as "from," "late with," "formerly of," in characters of equal size with those in which the name of the late firm appears. Unless probability of deception is avoided, an injunction is to be anticipated even though there has been delay, short of the period fixed by the Statute of Limitations, and if the proceedings fail on some special ground, still the wrongful conduct may be punished in costs. A former proprietor of a business which has passed to others is legally as well as morally bound not to interfere with the enjoyment of the business and its goodwill by the new proprietors, and the law will not allow him to regain, by private solicitations, the business with which he has publicly parted; though, on the other hand, there is nothing to prevent him from establishing a similar business, if he can do so, independently of his former connection.

LAWYERS IN PARLIAMENT.

The following members of the legal profession had been elected members of the new Parliament up to Wednesday last, in addition to those whose names were given last week. The names of members of the old Parliament are given in italics:—

ENGLAND AND WALES.

BARRISTERS.

BERKSHIRE—*Mr. John Walter* (L)
 BOSTON—*Mr. William James Ingram* (L)
 BUCKINGHAMSHIRE—*Hon. Thomas Francis Fremantle* (C)
 CARDIGANSHIRE—*Mr. Lewis Pugh Pugh* (L)
 CARNARVONSHIRE—*Mr. Watkin Williams, Q.C.* (L)
 CHESHIRE, EAST—*Mr. William Cunliffe Brooks* (C)
 CORNWALL, EAST—*Hon. Thomas Agar Robartes* (L)
 DEVONSHIRE, EAST—*Sir John Kennaway, Bart.* (C)
 KENT, EAST—*Mr. Edward Leigh Pemberton* (C)
 LANCASHIRE, SOUTH-EAST—*Right Hon. Richard Assheton Cross* (C)
 MONTGOMERYSHIRE—*Mr. Stuart Rendel* (L)
 STAFFORDSHIRE, WEST—*Mr. Alexander Staveley Hill, Q.C.* (C)
 SURREY, EAST—*Mr. William Grantham, Q.C.* (C)
 WARWICKSHIRE, SOUTH—*Sir John Eardley Wilmot, Bart.* (C)
 WIGHT, ISLE OF—*Hon. Evelyn Ashley* (L)
 WORCESTERSHIRE, EAST—*Mr. George Woodyatt Hastings* (L)

SOLICITORS.

RADNORSHIRE—*Sir Richard Green Price, Bart.* (L)
 SUSSEX, EAST—*Mr. George Burrow Gregory* (C)

IRELAND.

BARRISTERS.

ANTRIM—*Mr. Edward McNaghten* (C)
 KILKENNY—*Mr. Patrick Martin* (HR)
 KING'S COUNTY—*Mr. Bernard Charles Molloy* (HR)
 LONDONDERRY—*Right Hon. Hugh Lav, Q.C.* (L)
 LOUTH—*Mr. Alexander Martin Sullivan* (HR)
 TYRONE—*Mr. John William Ellison Macartney* (C);
 Mr. Edward Litton, Q.C. (L)

SOLICITORS.

CAVAN—*Mr. Charles Joseph Fay* (HR)
 MONAGHAN—*Mr. John Givan* (L)

SCOTLAND.

BARRISTERS AND ADVOCATES.

ELGIN BOROUGH—*Mr. Mounstuart Elphinstone Grant Duff* (L)
 HADDINGTON BOROUGH—*Sir David Wedderburn, Bart.* (L)
 ROXBURGHSHIRE—*Hon. Arthur Ralph Douglas Elliott* (L)
 STIRLING BOROUGH—*Mr. Henry Campbell Bannerman* (L)

General Correspondence.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—*All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer. The Editor cannot undertake to return MSS. forwarded to him.*

AFFIDAVITS BY MARKSMEN.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—It may, perhaps, be useful, not only to your correspondent J. H., but likewise to others, if I mention that the question he asks having oftentimes arisen I have taken pains to ascertain the practice in reference to it, and it appears that no fee whatever is allowable, on taxation, to a commissioner for reading over an affidavit to a marksman.

The reading over of the affidavit by the commissioner is purely optional on his part. The several terms of jurats applicable to such cases show this. For instance, the affidavit may—(1) be read over by him; or (2), in his presence; or (3), by a third party elsewhere than in his presence, in which latter case such third party would have to be sworn as a witness to the reading, &c.

T. W. BRAITHWAITE.

CERTIFICATES OF SEARCH FOR JUDGMENTS, &c.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—The new rules provide, by ord. 60a, r. 8, that "the Registrar of Judgments shall, on request in writing giving sufficient particulars, and on payment of the prescribed fee, cause a search to be made in the registers or indexes under his custody, and issue a certificate of the result of the search."

This provision may prove acceptable to solicitors, and relieve them of much responsibility. At the same time any person is at liberty to make a search himself as heretofore.

The requisition for search should be forwarded to the registrar some days before the certificate of the result of search is required to be issued. And the requisition is so framed that a search can be directed to be made up to two o'clock on any following day, after which hour no incumbrances can be registered. The object in limiting the time for registering is to enable a purchaser to complete his purchase without risk of execution creditors and other incumbrancers registering their charges, at the time of, or immediately before, his purchase, if such purchase takes place after two o'clock.

The form of requisition for a search may be obtained gratis at the Register Office. The period stated in the form over which the search should extend is the usual search made for incumbrances in the office by solicitors. If it is required that the search should cover any other period of time, the particulars on the face of the form can be varied to meet the case, or a full indorsement can be written on the back of the requisition stating the time over which the search is desired to be made. There must

be a separate requisition for every person searched for. A charge for the official certificate will be made in addition to the search fee of 1s. The fee to be paid for such certificate has yet to be provided for by order.

For further particulars, or forms of requisition for search, application can be made personally at the Register Office, or by letter addressed to "The Registrar of Judgments, Royal Courts of Justice, London, W.C."

April 10.

JAMES PASK, Chief Clerk.

[The following is the form of Requisition for Search:—

To the Registrar of Judgments, Royal Courts of Justice, London, W.C.

The day of _____, 188 .
Search for judgments, *lites pendentes*, and Crown debts for five years ending the day of _____, 188 . And for annuities and executions from the year 1855 and 1864, respectively, to the said day of _____, 188 , in the following name:—

Surname.(a)	Christian name or names.	Usual or last known place of abode.	Title, trade, or profession.

(a) The name must be legibly written with full address and additions.

Name and address of solicitor

State if it is desired that the certificate of result be forwarded through post-office.]

STAYING PROCEEDINGS UNDER EXECUTION AGAINST COMPANY BEING WOUND UP.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I shall be glad if you will allow me to call attention to the decision of the Master of the Rolls in *Re The Artistic Colour Printing Company (Limited)*, noted by you last week (*ante*, p. 441). The company was being wound up voluntarily, and the application was by the liquidator for an injunction to restrain a creditor from proceeding to levy execution on a judgment obtained against the company in the Exchequer Division. The Master of the Rolls held that the execution was a proceeding in the action, and that subsection (5) of section 24 of the Judicature Act, 1873, providing that no cause or proceeding pending in the High Court should be restrained, applied; and, accordingly, that he had no jurisdiction to grant an injunction, and that the proper course was to apply to the Exchequer Division to stay proceedings.

Since the decision of the Master of the Rolls in *Re Peoples' Garden Company* (24 W. R. 40), it has been generally admitted that the Chancery Division cannot, in a winding up (under section 85 of the Companies Act, 1862, or otherwise), restrain actions or proceedings pending in the other Divisions, but the notion has existed that the issue of, or proceedings under, an execution could still be restrained. The following are a few cases in point:—

In re Perkins Beach Lead Mining Company (26 W. R. 164, L. R. 7 Ch. D. 371), Bacon, V.C.—sale by sheriff under *fi. fa.* restrained; *Ex parte Railway Steel and Plant Company* (L. R. 8 Ch. D. 183), Hall, V.C.—ditto; *Victoria and Fenton Company* (Bacon, V.C., 31 May, 1876, Reg. Lib. B. 914)—issue of execution restrained; *Pennesley Mining Company* (M.R., 2 July, 1877, Reg. Lib. B. 1162)—ditto; *Crown Match Company* (M.R., 17 April, 1878, Reg. Lib. A. 680)—sheriff restrained from selling under *fi. fa.*; *Whitwick Colliery Company* (M.R., 22 November, 1878, B. 2035)—ditto; *Belper Laid Company* (Malins, V.C., 6 November, 1878, Reg. Lib. 1885)—sheriff and purchaser restrained

from removing goods sold under execution; *In re Stanhope Silkstone Company* (27 W. R. 561, L. R. 11 Ch. D. 160)—in which case the Court of Appeal (discharging an order of Fry, J.) granted an injunction restraining a judgment creditor from further proceedings under garnishee orders. In all these cases the proceedings were pending in the Common Law Divisions.

It was, no doubt, a singular construction of section 24 that, although the Chancery Division could not restrain an action pending in another Division, it could nevertheless deprive the plaintiff of the fruits of his judgment, but I do not think that the point now raised was discussed in any of the above cases. The recent decision of the Master of the Rolls will probably put an end to the practice of granting such injunctions, and application will have to be made in each case to the Division in which the action is pending.

Nevertheless, there can, I think, be little doubt that it is more convenient that the Chancery Division should have power to stop proceedings against a company where a winding-up petition is pending, or where a voluntary winding up is in progress, and it is to be hoped that a new rule will be made enabling the Chancery Division in such cases to stay proceedings in actions and proceedings pending in the other Divisions.

Lincoln's-inn, April 13.

FRANCIS B. PALMER.

THE NEW FORMS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—As your readers all know, there were recently issued to the public new rules and forms, intitled "New Rules of the Supreme Court, April, 1880," the 2nd of which rules states that they shall come into operation on the 6th day of April, 1880.

Rule 34 states that a summons at chambers shall be in the form H. 1 in the schedule thereto.

Rule 35 states that the summons shall be prepared by the applicant or his solicitor.

Having had occasion to issue summonses of a special nature in the Common Pleas Division about the 9th instant, I obtained from one of the firms of law stationers whose names appear upon the title-pages of the rules, a number of printed forms of summons according to form H. 1 in the schedule, and duly filled them up, as therein directed.

On my presenting one of these summonses to the clerk of the judge at chambers for issuing, he declined to issue it, and on my pressing him for his reasons he, to my surprise, said an order had been made postponing the use of the new forms for a fortnight.

The consequence was that my time and expense were entirely thrown away, and I ultimately had to issue the summonses on the old forms.

I have no doubt that hundreds of solicitors are under the same impression with regard to these new forms as I was, and I shall, therefore, be glad if you will insert this in your next issue in order that others may be warned, and so save themselves similar waste of time and money.

A SOLICITOR.

BILLS OF SALE.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I was very much pleased to see from the *SOLICITORS' JOURNAL*, of the 10th instant, that no person would be allowed to inspect or take any extract from any of the registers or indices of the filing of bills of sale, or any document filed in connection therewith, until he has specified in writing to the officer in charge of the register the name against which he wishes to search, and has satisfied the officer as to the object of the search. This is certainly most satisfactory, as it will, to some extent, prevent the circulation of the so-called Trade Protection circulars. A great number of the documents filed as bills of sale are, in fact, only con-

tracts for hiring, and it seems to me most unfair that the name of a person hiring furniture should be advertised through the land as if he had given a bill of sale over his goods.

You hint at a list published by authority, but this would be only one degree better than the late practice. I think it should be left to a person about to deal with another to ascertain for himself, by search, if his goods are protected by a bill of sale or not.

I trust you will excuse my troubling you on this subject.

ALPHA.

Bath, April 14.

[See observations under the head of "Current Topics."
—Ed. S.J.]

LEGAL WIDTH OF ROAD.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—(1) A. holds under a building lease a field, along the edge of which there is a pathway used by the public. A. being about to build a wall along the side of the field to shut off the pathway from the remainder of the field has consulted me with reference to the narrowest width of way which it is legally allowable for him to leave.

(2) Under the same lease the lessor has covenanted to convert a portion of a pathway over the lessor's adjoining property into a roadway. My client, who is very precise, consults me as to the greatest width of roadway his lessor is legally compellable to allow.

I am not aware that there is any very strictly defined width prescribed by law in either case, but I should feel obliged if any of your readers would have the goodness to assist me with any information on the points.

A SUBSCRIBER.

New Orders, &c.

JUDGES' CHAMBERS.

Notice with reference to the transfer of business in chambers from Rolls-gardens to the Royal Courts of Justice.

On and after Monday next, the 19th of April, all summonses, whether before a judge or master, must be attended at the Royal Courts of Justice, and not at the Judges' Chambers in Rolls-gardens.

All summonses will be issued and orders drawn up on the ground-floor.

The judge and masters will sit for the hearing of summonses on the court-floor.

With regard to masters' summonses, in lieu of the present practice, they will be heard by separate masters according to the following alphabetical divisions:—A to F, G to N, and O to Z, and summonses will be issued and orders drawn up accordingly.

Provision will be made for issuing summonses according to the above alphabetical divisions on Saturday next, April the 17th.

Solicitors and their clerks attending summonses are requested to meet in the room No. 81 on the ground-floor.

The room reserved for the bar is No. 100 on the court-floor.

A very ingenious invention has been brought to our notice for fastening together papers. It is called McGill's Patent Single Stroke Staple Press, and consists of a small press, not unlike that used for stamping dies. In the end of the lever there is placed one of the small brass staple fasteners, of which boxes of various sizes are supplied. The corner of the papers to be fastened is placed underneath, and by a single stroke of the hand the staple is thrust through the papers, and the ends doubled back into the papers so as to preclude the possibility of the fastener coming loose or injuring the hand in dealing with the papers. There is no difficulty in securely fastening together, with great rapidity, papers of a great many sheets. The agents for the invention are Messrs. Lotz & Co., 20, Barbican, London.

Cases of the Week.

FOREIGN ATTACHMENT.—MAYOR'S COURT OF CITY OF LONDON.—In a case of *The London Joint Stock Bank v. The Mayor and Aldermen of London*, before the Court of Appeal on the 8th inst., a curious question arose with reference to the custom of "foreign attachment" in the city of London. The action was brought by the bank in the Common Pleas Division, claiming a writ of prohibition, to prohibit the mayor, and aldermen, and the judge of the Mayor's Court from further proceeding in a process of foreign attachment, which had been commenced against the bank in an action of debt entered in the Mayor's Court by Sarah Griessell against Thomas Griessell. Immediately after the entry of that action, the plaintiff in it issued the process against the bank, attaching the moneys of the defendant in their hands as garnishees. The bank then applied to the Common Pleas Division for a rule nisi for a prohibition, and in answer to their declaration in prohibition, the corporation pleaded the ancient custom of foreign attachment of the city of London. The plea stated the custom to be that if, in an action of debt in the Mayor's Court, the defendant should be summoned to appear to answer the plaintiff, and the serjeant-at-mace should return that the defendant had nothing within the city whereby he might be summoned, and then the defendant at the same court should make default, and thereupon the plaintiff should testify that some other person carrying on business within the city had any goods of the defendant in his custody within the city, or was indebted to the defendant in any sum of money arising or accruing within the city, then the court should command the serjeant-at-mace to attach the defendant by such goods or sum of money; and then if the serjeant-at-mace certified to the court the defendant to be attached accordingly, and the defendant at that and three other courts then next severally holden, being solemnly called, did not appear, but made default, and those four defaults were recorded against him, if the plaintiff appeared at each of the four courts, then at the last of the four courts, or at any court holden after the four defaults recorded, at the petition of the plaintiff, it had been the custom for the court to command the serjeant-at-mace to warn the garnishee to appear at any court afterwards to be holden to show cause why the plaintiff ought not to have judgment and execution of the goods or debt attached. And, if the garnishee, being solemnly called, did not appear, but made default, it had been the custom to award the plaintiff to have judgment and execution of the goods or debt attached to satisfy the plaintiff's debt, or so much thereof as they would respectively extend to satisfy, the plaintiff giving pledges to restore the same to the defendant if he, within a year and a day, came into court and disproved the debt claimed by the plaintiff. The plea alleged that all the above-mentioned preliminary proceedings in default had been taken in the action against the defendant Thos. Griessell. The Common Pleas Division, upon a demurrer by the bank to the plea, decided that a corporation was not within the custom, and that the attachment could not be enforced against them by means of a *fi. fa.* (*vide* L. R. 1 O. P. D. 1). The Court of Appeal, when the case first came before it, was of opinion that the facts did not sufficiently appear, and referred it to an arbitrator to state the facts in a special case. By the case thus stated it appeared that the practice relating to foreign attachment had, for the last two centuries at least, been entirely different from that which was alleged by the plea. The practice had been for the plaintiff simply to enter his action against the defendant. No process was issued against the defendant, and no notice was given to him of the action or the attachment, but the plaintiff made an affidavit of debt and gave information that the defendant had goods or money in the hands of a garnishee within the jurisdiction. A notice was then served on the garnishee, attaching the goods and moneys of the defendant in his hands to answer the plaintiff, and warning him not to part with them without licence of the court. A *scire facias* was then issued, calling on the garnishee to appear and show cause why the plaintiff should not have execution of the goods or moneys of the defendant in his hands. This was served on the garnishee, and, if he did not appear, judgment for the plaintiff was given against him by default. If he did

appear, the appearance was recorded, and then a record was made up which stated, not only the proceedings which had actually taken place, but also all the preliminary proceedings by default against the defendant, which were set forth in the plea, but which never in fact took place. The special case stated that "there is no doubt that the preliminary proceedings thus fictitiously alleged have, for at least two centuries past, ceased to be more than formal, but it cannot be ascertained at what precise period they became so." Under these circumstances, the Court of Appeal (JAMES, BAGGALLAY, and BRAMWELL, L.JJ.) held that the plea of the corporation had not been proved, and that on this simple ground the bank were entitled to judgment in prohibition. The corporation had pleaded a certain custom, and had averred that it had been followed. It now appeared that the alleged preliminary proceedings against the defendant were all a fiction, and that nothing of the kind had taken place. The plea was, therefore, not proved. JAMES and BRAMWELL, L.JJ., intimated an opinion (though not a final one) that the Common Pleas Division was right in holding that the custom did not extend to a body corporate, but BAGGALLAY, L.J., said that, as at present advised, he was not disposed to agree with that decision.—SOLICITORS, *Clarke, Raschins, & Clarke; T. J. Nelson.*

SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE—LEASE BY COMMITTEE OF LUNATIC—SIGNATURE IN COMMITTEE'S OWN NAME—VALIDITY—CONDITION OF SALE—EVIDENCE OF PERFORMANCE OF COVENANTS IN LEASE—PRODUCTION OF LAST RECEIPT FOR RENT—CONTINUING BREACH OF COVENANT.—In a case of *Laurie v. Lees*, before the Court of Appeal on the 8th inst., a question arose as to the validity of a lease by the committee of a lunatic. The demised property belonged to three partners in trade, one of whom was a lunatic. The Court of Lunacy had authorized the committees of the estate of the lunatic, in the name and on behalf of the lunatic, to execute the lease. The lease purported to be made by the lunatic by the committees (naming them) and the other partners, but the committees each signed the lease in his own name (not in the name of the lunatic), and a seal was placed opposite the name of each of them. The attestation clause stated that the deed was signed, sealed, and delivered by the committees, naming them as individuals, not as committees. The action was brought by a purchaser of the lease against his vendor claiming to have the contract for sale declared void, or, in the alternative, specific performance of the contract if it should appear that the defendant could make a good title to the property. Hall, V.C., held that the lease had not been duly executed by the committees, and that on this ground a good title had not been shown to the lease. The Court of Appeal (JAMES, BAGGALLAY, and BRAMWELL, L.JJ.) reversed this decision, and held that the lease had been duly executed. There was nothing, BRAMWELL, L.J., said, to show that the seal was not that of the lunatic. Another objection to the title taken in the Court of Appeal arose in this way:—One of the conditions of sale provided that "the production of the last receipt for rent paid shall be taken as conclusive evidence of the due and satisfactory performance of the lessee's covenants contained in the lease, or the waiver of any breaches of the same covenants up to the time of the completion of the purchase, whether the lessor shall be cognizant of such breaches (if any) or not." The lease contained a covenant by the lessee to use the whole of the premises as a public-house or in connection therewith, and it appeared that he had in fact underlet a part of the premises, and that this part was used for another purpose. The purchaser contended that there being thus a continuing breach of the covenant, the condition was not binding on him and a good title was not shown. Another condition provided for the production of the lease at the sale, and the particulars of sale expressly stated the fact of the underletting of a part of the premises. The court held that the purchaser was bound by the condition, and overruled the objection.—SOLICITORS, *C. F. Yorke; Hunters, Guatkins, & Haynes.*

WILL—CONSTRUCTION—LIFE INTEREST—POWER OF DISPOSITION.—In a case of *In re Thomson*, before the Court of Appeal on the 9th inst., a testator had, by his will, given real and personal estate to his wife "for the term of her natural life, to be disposed of as she may think proper for

her own use and benefit, according to the nature and quality thereof. . . And in the event of her decease, should there be anything remaining of the said property, or any part thereof," the testator gave "the said part or parts thereof" to B. The wife survived the testator, and afterwards died, having made a will by which she gave the residue of her real and personal estate to H. The question was whether certain leasehold property of the testator passed under the will of the widow to H. Hall, V.C., held that, under the will of the testator, the widow took a life interest, with a power of disposition only during her life, but that she had no power of disposition by will, and that, consequently, the leasehold property in question passed to B. and to H. This decision was affirmed by the Court of Appeal (JAMES, BAGGALLAY, and BRAMWELL, L.JJ.), who also intimated an opinion that the widow took nothing but a life interest, though it was not necessary to decide that point, because she had not attempted to dispose of the property by deed in her life-time.—SOLICITORS, *Thomson & Edwards; Brownlow & Howe.*

BOOTY OF WAR—GRANT BY ROYAL WARRANT FOR DISTRIBUTION—TRUST—RIGHT TO SUE IN HIGH COURT.—In a case of *Kinloch v. The Secretary of State for India in Council*, before the Court of Appeal on the 13th inst., a question arose as to the right to sue one of the responsible Ministers of the Crown for an account of booty taken by the military forces of the Crown, which had been by a royal warrant granted to him for distribution among the persons entitled thereto. The booty in question was captured in India in the course of the war which followed on the mutiny in 1857. By an order in council, made in 1864, under the Act 3 & 4 Vict. c. 65, the Queen referred it to the judge of the Court of Admiralty to determine the persons who were, and the proportions in which they were, entitled to share in the booty. The judge having determined this, her Majesty, by a royal warrant in November, 1866, granted the booty to the Secretary of State for India in Council, in trust for distribution by him, or by any other person or persons whom he might appoint among the persons who, according to the judgment of the Court of Admiralty, were entitled to share in it. And the warrant further directed that, in case any doubt should arise in respect of the distribution of the booty or any claim thereto, it should be determined by the Secretary of State, or such persons to whom he should refer the same, which determination was to be final unless within three months, "we shall be pleased otherwise to order, hereby reserving to ourselves the right to make such order therein as to us shall seem fit." The plaintiff brought the action on behalf of himself and all other persons who under the royal grant were entitled to share in the booty, and he claimed an account of the booty, and of all sums of money paid or applied under the provisions of the grant, and direction for the distribution of any balance remaining undisposed of in the defendants' hands in accordance with the provisions of the royal grant. The plaintiff alleged that the defendant had still in his hands a large part of the property which he refused to distribute or account for. The Secretary of State demurred to the statement of claim. Hall, V.C., overruled the demurrer, on the ground that, by the royal warrant, a trust had been created, and that the Secretary of State was liable to be sued as a trustee. The Court of Appeal (JAMES, BAGGALLAY, and BRAMWELL, L.JJ.) reversed this decision, and allowed the demurrer, holding that no trust, in the legal sense of the word, had been created by the warrant, which was nothing more (as JAMES, L.J., said) than a direction by the sovereign authorizing her servant having possession of her money to deal with it in a certain way. He was to deal with the money as the agent of the Crown, under his responsibility to Parliament, and subject to the liability to account to the Crown and the Parliament. It would be a violation of legal principle for a municipal court to take upon itself to enforce directions which the Crown was minded to give to one of the great officers of State. The only appeal from his decision was to the Queen herself.—SOLICITORS, *Whitakers & Woolbert; H. Treasure.*

PRACTICE—MOTION TO COMMIT—COSTS FIXED BY JUDGE.—In a case of *Re Pyffe*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 9th inst., a motion was made to commit the defendant, an executor, for non-payment into court of a sum in his hands

in disobedience to a previous order of the court. No opposition was made to the order, but it was directed not to be drawn up for a fortnight, to give the executor time for payment. Counsel for the applicant then asked his lordship to fix an amount in respect of the costs of the motion, which were payable by the defendant, and his lordship accordingly fixed the amount of such costs, after looking at the applicant's brief, at five guineas. JESSEL, M.R., said that he had ample jurisdiction to assess the costs instead of the taxing master, and even against the wish of the respondent. He said he frequently did so in chambers, and that the parties found the practice very convenient, and, in fact, a saving of expense.—SOLICITORS, *Lanfear & Stewart*; *O. B. Wooler*.

COMPANY—POWER TO PURCHASE ITS OWN SHARES—COMPANIES ACTS, 1862, 1867, 1877.—In the case of *In re Dronfield Silkestone Coal Company (Limited)*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 10th inst., an important question was raised whether a company can, by inserting a power to do so in its articles of association, purchase its own shares. The vendor to the company had entered into an arrangement with them by which the company were to purchase, on certain terms, certain shares issued to him. The transaction was carried out perfectly *bona fide*, and the company were placed on the list of shareholders as the owners of the shares. The memorandum of association contained the usual powers for a coal company, and the general clause at the end of its powers, "to do all things conducive for the attainment of the above objects." The liquidator of the company had now taken out a summons that the vendor might be placed on the list of contributories. JESSEL, M.R., said that, although he could not but consider it a case of hardship against the vendor, he was bound to decide the matter according to his view of the law. He considered there were insuperable difficulties in holding such a transaction valid. The first question was whether the company had a right to purchase its own shares. It was contended that the transaction would come under the words in the memorandum giving power to do all things "conducive to the above objects." He could not, however, say that these words would include a general power of trafficking in their own shares, which was what was here contended for. There was, therefore, no power to purchase its own shares in the memorandum. Now, the articles, in his opinion, were distinct on the point. There was a distinct power in the articles to traffic in the shares, and that power was, in his opinion, inconsistent with the memorandum, and therefore, according to the decision of the House of Lords in *Ashbury Carriage Company v. Riche* (L. R. 7 H. L. 653), invalid. Another question was whether such a power was not beyond the purview of the Companies Acts, and therefore illegal on that ground. By section 23 it was pointed out who were to be "members" of the company. The subscribers to the memorandum first of all, and then all other persons who had agreed to be members, and whose names were entered on the register. He could not see how a company could be a "member" of its own company, and, in his opinion, such a transaction would be invalid on that ground. Another question was whether such a purchase would not in effect be a diminution of the capital of the company mentioned in the memorandum. There was no decided case on the point, but it was plain, from the judgment of James, L.J., in *Hope v. International Financial Society*, L. R. 4 Ch. 327, that a forfeiture of shares was not treated in the Act as a diminution of capital. As to a surrender of shares there was more difficulty. No doubt certain surrenders were allowed, and that must, to a certain extent, diminish the capital, but he was not prepared to say that a right to accept a surrender could authorize the company to buy up its own shares. Looking at the whole purview of the Companies Acts, it was impossible to hold that a company could buy up its own shares. The result was that the transaction was void, and that the vendor was still a shareholder and contributory in the company. Having regard to the hardship of the case, he should not order the vendor to pay any costs.—SOLICITORS, *Emmet & Son*; *Pilgrim & Phillips*.

proper form of judgment when, in a foreclosure action, the court, under the provisions of section 48 of the Act 15 & 16 Vict. c. 86, at the request of a puisne incumbrancer, directs a sale of the mortgaged property instead of a foreclosure. The form of judgment given in *Seton on Decrees* (4th ed.), vol. 2, p. 1038, after directing a sale, goes on to direct a foreclosure in the ordinary way in case the property shall not have been sold within four months from the date of the chief clerk's certificate of what was due to the plaintiff on his mortgage. FRY, J., directed a foreclosure if the property should not be sold within three months from the date of the judgment.—SOLICITORS, *G. Burges*; *Combe & Wainwright*.

MORTGAGOR AND MORTGAGEE—FORECLOSURE—PROPERTY TAKEN COMPULSORILY UNDER LANDS CLAUSES ACT—EXTRA COSTS OF ASSESSING VALUE—JUST ALLOWANCES—FORM OF INQUIRY.—In a case of *Rees v. The Metropolitan Board of Works*, before Fry, J., on the 9th inst., a question arose as to the costs to which a mortgagee would be entitled as "just allowances" under the ordinary inquiry (*vide Seton on Decrees*, 4th ed., vol. 2, pp. 1072, 1079), "whether anything and what is due to the plaintiff for any and what costs, charges, and expenses properly incurred by him in respect of his mortgage security" not being costs of the action. The action was brought by a first mortgagee for a foreclosure, the defendants being the mortgagor and some subsequent mortgagees. The Metropolitan Board of Works, who had under their statutory powers agreed to purchase the property, were also made defendants, but, on their paying the assessed value of the property into court, further proceedings were stayed as against them. The plaintiff's counsel asked that a special direction might be inserted in the judgment that, in taking the account of what was due to the plaintiff, there were to be included the extra costs incurred by him on the inquiry as to the value of the property, beyond those costs which had been paid to him by the Board of Works. FRY, J., held that such a direction ought not to be inserted. If the costs in question were just allowances, the plaintiff would get them under the ordinary form of inquiry; if they were not just allowances, he ought not to have them at all.—SOLICITORS, *A. R. Steele*; *Boyce & Ridley*.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS—ACTION TO RECOVER ANNUITY CHARGED ON LAND—DISABILITY—COVERTURE—3 & 4 WILL. 4, c. 27, s. 42—37 & 38 VICT. c. 57, ss. 1, 3.—In a case of *Waller v. Tanqueray*, before Fry, J., on the 13th inst., the action was brought by a married woman, by her next friend, to recover the arrears of an annuity charged on land which had been devised to her by a will for her separate use without power of anticipation. She became entitled to the annuity in possession in 1860, and had never received any payment of it. The action was commenced in 1879. It was objected that the plaintiff's right to sue was altogether barred by the expiration of twelve years, under section 1 of the Real Property Limitation Act, 1874. On the behalf of the plaintiff it was urged that, as she was under the disability of coverture, her right to sue was preserved by section 3 of the Act. To this it was answered that, as the plaintiff could sue in equity by a next friend to recover property to which she was entitled for her separate use, she was not really under disability in relation to the property, though she was under coverture. FRY, J., held that the right to sue for the arrears of the annuity would have been barred by section 1, on the authority of *James v. Satter* (3 Bing. N. C. 544) a decision upon section 2 of the Act 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 27, but for section 3, and that the protection given by section 3 by reason of the disability of coverture applied to an equitable right to sue as well as to a legal right. The plaintiff, therefore, was still entitled to sue; but, by virtue of section 42 of the Act 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 27, she could only recover the arrears of the annuity for six years back from the date of the issue of the writ.—SOLICITORS, *H. Gross Smith*; *Warry, Robins, & Burgess*.

MORTGAGOR AND MORTGAGEE—FORECLOSURE ACTION—SALE INSTEAD OF FORECLOSURE—15 & 16 VICT. c. 86, s. 48—FORM OF JUDGMENT.—In a case of *Robins v. Maclean*, before Fry, J., on the 9th inst., a question arose as to the

Obituary.

MR. RICHARD WINGFIELD BAKER.

Mr. Richard Wingfield Baker, barrister, of Orsett Hall, Essex, died at Sherborne, Dorsetshire, about a fortnight ago, in consequence of injuries sustained by a fall from his horse when hunting, in his seventy-ninth year. Mr. Baker was the third son of the late Mr. William Wingfield, who was for many years a master in chancery, and who assumed the name of Baker by royal licence, his mother being a daughter of the second Earl of Digby. He was born in 1802. He was educated at Rugby, and at Christ Church, Oxford, and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in 1837. Mr. Baker was secretary of Commissions to his brother-in-law, the first Lord Cottenham, when Lord Chancellor. In 1857 he contested the Southern Division of the county of Essex in the Liberal interest, when he defeated Sir William Smyth by seventeen votes. At the general election of 1859 he was beaten by Mr. Percy Watlington, and in 1865 he was again unsuccessful. In 1868 he was returned without opposition, but he was defeated again in 1874. He was very popular with all parties in Essex, being a man of very generous and charitable disposition, and a liberal landlord. He was a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant for the county, and was high sheriff in 1867. He was elected one of the chairmen of quarter sessions for Essex in 1863, but retired from that office last year. He was for many years captain of the first Essex Artillery Volunteers. Mr. Baker was married to a daughter of the late Sir John Hanmer, bart.

MR. CHRISTOPHER CHESHIRE.

Mr. Christopher Cheshire, solicitor, of Northwich, died at his residence, Hey Wood, Hartford, on the 29th ult. Mr. Cheshire was the son of Mr. John Cheshire, solicitor, of Northwich, and he was born in 1819. He was admitted a solicitor in 1842, and had practised at Northwich for over forty years. He was formerly in partnership with Mr. Thomas Richard Barker, but more recently he was associated with his son, Mr. Walter Christopher Cheshire, who was admitted a solicitor in 1872. Mr. Cheshire had a very extensive practice, and was a perpetual commissioner for Cheshire, clerk to the Northwich Board of Guardians, Assessment Committee, and Rural Sanitary Authority, superintendent registrar, registrar of the Northwich County Court (Circuit No. 7), clerk to the county magistrates, and clerk to the East Eddisbury Highway Board.

MR. WILLIAM SHIELD.

Mr. William Shield, solicitor, of Uppingham, died at Wing, near Oakham, on the 24th ult. Mr. Shield was born in 1796. He was admitted a solicitor in 1818, and he had practised for many years at Uppingham. He was a perpetual commissioner for Rutlandshire, Lincolnshire, and Northamptonshire, and he had a very large private practice, and held many important public appointments. He was registrar of the Uppingham County Court (Circuit No. 10), and coroner for Rutlandshire. He was also clerk to the Uppingham Board of Guardians, Assessment Committee, and Rural Sanitary Authority, superintendent registrar for the Uppingham District, solicitor to the Uppingham Gas Light and Coke Company, clerk and solicitor to the Uppingham Association for the Prosecution of Felons, steward of the manor of Liddington, and joint clerk (with his son Mr. William Thomas Shield, who was admitted in 1871) to the magistrates of the East Norton Division. Mr. Shield was the oldest solicitor in Rutlandshire.

MR. GEORGE WILLIAM HODGE.

Mr. George William Hodge, solicitor, died at Newcastle-upon-Tyne last week. Mr. Hodge was born in 1818, and was admitted a solicitor in 1839, and he had practised for over forty years at Newcastle. He was for many years in partnership with Mr. William Harle, but more recently he had been associated with Mr. George Frederick Westmacott. He was the legal adviser of many of the largest commercial firms at Newcastle, and he had

a very extensive practice in bankruptcy. He was a perpetual commissioner for Newcastle-upon-Tyne and the counties of Durham and Northumberland, and a member of the Incorporated Law Society and the Newcastle Law Society. He was also deputy-recorder of the borough and deputy-judge of the borough Court of Record. Mr. Hodge took an active interest in municipal affairs. He was a member of the town council for All Saints' West Ward from 1862 till 1878, and was for several years chairman of the Town Moor and Parks Management Committee. He also served on the Parliamentary Committee, and rendered valuable services in the framing of the new bye-laws for the corporation. He was sheriff of Newcastle for the year 1868-9. His politics were Conservative. Mr. Hodge's health had for some time been failing, and his death is universally lamented. He leaves a widow and several children. A local journal says of Mr. Hodge:—Mr. Hodge obtained his certificate as a solicitor in 1839, and he had long been looked upon and esteemed as one of the ablest and soundest lawyers in our town or district. He enjoyed a large and lucrative practice, especially in connection with shipping and other commercial questions. His great coolness and judgment, coupled with his profound legal knowledge, won the confidence and respect of his clients, as well as of the tribunals before which he practised; while his gentlemanly and courteous demeanour rendered him agreeable and readily accessible to all with whom he came into contact. He was well versed in bankruptcy law; and in all important cases which were wont to find their way into the old Bankruptcy Court in the Arcade, in the days of Commissioner Ellison and Commissioner Abraham, his services were generally found to have been engaged on either one side or the other, his most powerful rival in this respect having been the late Mr. W. Lookay Harle. The deceased was a zealous member of the Incorporated Law Society; and on the occasion of the meeting of that association in Newcastle many years ago, he was chiefly instrumental in carrying to a successful issue the necessary local arrangements. Mr. Hodge was for many years closely identified with the service of the town. He entered the council as one of the representatives of West All Saints in the beginning of 1862; and it was in November, 1878, that, to the regret of his brother-councillors and of many fellow-townsmen, he retired from that position. During his connection with the corporation, he took an active and intelligent part in the deliberations of that body; and in the municipal year of 1868-69, under the mayoralty of the late Mr. Morrison, he discharged in an efficient manner the office of sheriff. He also for some time acted as chairman of the Town Moor and Parks Management Committee, and in this capacity his services were highly appreciated by his colleagues. In this way, and by frequent intercourse with the town clerk, he acquired an intimate knowledge of corporate law and procedure; and when a vacancy occurred in that office by the lamented death of Mr. Ralph Park Phillips, general disappointment was felt that the state of Mr. Hodge's health did not admit of his becoming a candidate for the position.

MR. WILLIAM WEST.

Mr. William West, solicitor, of Bromyard, died at that place on the 30th ult. Mr. West was admitted a solicitor in 1830, and practised for nearly fifty years at Bromyard. He was a commissioner to administer oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature, and a perpetual commissioner for Herefordshire, and he had a very extensive private practice. He was for many years registrar of the Bromyard County Court (Circuit No. 73), and from 1840 till 1877 he was clerk to the county magistrates. On his retirement from office he was presented by the magistrates of the division with a handsome silver service as a testimony to the zealous and efficient manner in which he had discharged his duties as their clerk. Mr. West retired from practice about two years ago. He was buried at Bromyard on the 5th inst.

MR. JOHN DOBEDE TAYLOR.

Mr. John Dobede Taylor, solicitor, of Bishops Stortford, died at his residence at that place on the 6th inst. Mr.

Taylor was born in 1812, and was admitted a solicitor in 1833, and he had ever since practised at Bishops Stortford. He was originally in partnership with Mr. John Johnstone, and at a later date was associated with Mr. William Gee and Mr. Joseph Fairman, but more recently he had practised alone. The deceased had a large business. He was a perpetual commissioner for Essex and Hertfordshire, and held many important appointments, being clerk to the county magistrates, to the Commissioners of Land, Assessed, and Income Taxes, to the Bishops Stortford Burial Board, and to the trustees of the parish charities, solicitor to the Bishops Stortford Market Company and Gas Company, and to the Stanstead Association for the Prosecution of Felons, and steward of the manors of Ugley, Tednam-bury, Boutfieldbury, and Battles Hall. He was also for several years superintendent registrar and clerk to the Bishops Stortford Board of Guardians.

MR. ROBERT NORRIS.

Mr. Robert Norris, solicitor, died at Liverpool on the 4th inst. Mr. Norris was the son of Mr. Robert Norris, solicitor, the founder of an extensive legal business at Liverpool, and was born in 1830. He served his articles with his father, and was admitted a solicitor in 1852, and had practised at Liverpool for twenty-eight years. He was formerly associated with his father, and at a later date he was joined by his brother, the late Mr. George Norris. Mr. Norris was a commissioner to administer oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature. His practice was large and he enjoyed the confidence of many of the leading members of the mercantile community at Liverpool. His son, Mr. Robert Norris, jun., was admitted a solicitor in 1877.

MR. JOSHUA BIRD ALLEN.

Mr. Joshua Bird Allen, one of the chief clerks in the Chancery Division, died at his residence, 29, Queen's-gardens, Bayswater, on the 10th inst. Mr. Allen was the son of Mr. Joshua Julian Allen, solicitor, and was born in 1823. He was educated at St. Paul's School and at Trinity College, Cambridge, and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1847. He practised for about eight years as an equity draftsman and conveyancer, but he afterwards withdrew from the bar, and became articled to his father. He was admitted a solicitor in 1858, and practised for over ten years at 20, Bedford-row, in partnership with his father and with his younger brother, Mr. Charles John Allen. In 1869, he was appointed by Vice-Chancellor James to be one of his chief clerks, and he discharged the same office in the chambers of Vice-Chancellor Bacon until his death. Mr. Allen was married to the daughter of Lieutenant-Colonel William Morison. His son, Mr. William Bird Allen, was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn, in June, 1876, and practises in the Chancery Division.

Appointments, &c.

The MARQUIS OF BATH has been elected Chairman of the Wiltshire Quarter Sessions.

Mr. THOMAS CLAYHILLS, solicitor, of Darlington, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Married Women for the County of Durham and the North Riding of Yorkshire.

Mr. JOHN CLAYTON, solicitor, of Manchester and Ashton-under-Lyne, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for Lancashire for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women.

Mr. JOHN THOMPSON FITZADAM, barrister, has been appointed Recorder of the Borough of Wigan, in succession to Mr. Joseph Catterall, resigned. Mr. Fitzadam is the son of the late Mr. John Fitzadam, barrister, formerly recorder of Wigan, and was born in 1834. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1859, and he practises on the Northern Circuit and at the Lancashire, Liverpool, and Wigan Sessions.

Mr. CHARLES HENRY LEEMING, solicitor, of Halifax, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the

Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women for the West Riding of Yorkshire.

Mr. EUSTACE WILLIAM OWLES, solicitor, of No. 22, Chancery-lane, and Beckenham, Kent, has been elected a Member of the Beckenham Local Board.

Mr. ROGER MONTGOMERIE, advocate, has been appointed Deputy Clerk Register of Scotland, in succession to Mr. William Pitt Dundas, resigned. Mr. Montgomerie is the third son of the late Mr. William Eglinton Montgomerie, of Anne's Lodge, Ayrshire, and was born in 1828. He was educated at Rugby and at St. John's College, Cambridge, and he was called to the bar at Edinburgh. Mr. Montgomerie has been for several years an advocate depute. He was elected M.P. for South Ayrshire in the Conservative interest in 1874, but retired at the recent dissolution.

Dr. THOMAS SPINKS, Q.C., has been appointed by the Right Hon. Sir James Hannen to the office of Registrar of the York District Probate Registry of the High Court of Justice, in succession to Mr. Joseph Buckley, deceased. Dr. Spinks was educated at Merchant Taylors' School and at St. John's College, Oxford, where he graduated third class in classics in 1845, and he afterwards proceeded to the degree of D.C.L. He was admitted a member of the College of Advocates in Doctors' Commons in 1849, and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1858. Dr. Spinks is the author of a volume of Admiralty Reports. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1866, and he is a bencher of the Inner Temple.

Mr. NATHANIEL STRICKLAND, solicitor, of Bristol, has been elected Vestry Clerk of the parish of St. Paul's, Bristol. Mr. Strickland was admitted a solicitor in 1878, and is in partnership with Mr. James Livett Daniell.

Mr. VINCENT THOMAS THOMPSON, barrister, has been appointed Deputy-Recorder of the Borough of Leeds. Mr. Thompson is the son of the late Sergeant John Vincent Thompson. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, and he was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Trinity Term, 1858. He is a member of the North-Eastern Circuit, practising locally at Leeds.

Mr. JOHN ALEXANDER TILLEARD, solicitor (of the firm of Watney, Tilleard, & Freeman), of 34, Clement's-lane, has been elected Vestry Clerk of the Parish of All Hallows' Staining, on the resignation of his partner, Mr. John Watney, who is clerk to the Mercers' Company. Mr. Tilleard was admitted a solicitor in 1874.

Mr. JOHN TYSON, solicitor, of Barrow-in-Furness, Dalton, and Ulverston, has been elected Clerk to the Dalton Local Board. Mr. Tyson was admitted a solicitor in 1879.

Mr. GEORGE BERESFORD TURNER, solicitor (of the firm of Turner, Deane, & Elwes), has been appointed by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster to be Steward of the Manors of High Easter, Pleshey, and Dedham, in succession to his father, the late Mr. Sayers Turner. Mr. G. B. Turner was admitted a solicitor in 1872.

NEW LEGAL M.P.'S.

Mr. HENRY GEORGE ALLEN, Q.C., who has been elected M.P. for the Pembroke Boroughs in the Liberal interest, is the second son of the late Mr. John Hensleigh Allen, of Cresselly, Pembrokeshire, and was born in 1816. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated third class in classics, and he was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Easter Term, 1841. Mr. Allen has recently received a silk gown. He is a member of the South Wales and Chester Circuit, and he was for many years recorder of the borough of Andover. Mr. Allen is a magistrate and chairman of quarter sessions for Pembrokeshire.

Mr. MARSTON CLARKE BUSZARD, Q.C., who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Stamford in the Liberal interest, is the eldest son of Dr. Marston Buszard, of Lutworth. He was educated at Rugby, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated as a senior optime and in the third class of the classical tripos in 1860. He also obtained a second class in the LL.B. examination in the same year, and the Chancellor's Medal for legal studies in 1863. He was called to the bar at the

Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1862, and is a member of the Midland Circuit. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1877.

Mr. ARTHUR COHEN, Q.C., who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Southwark in the Liberal interest, is the son of the late Mr. Benjamin Cohen, of Richmond, Surrey, and was born in 1830. He was educated at University College, London, and at Magdalen College, Cambridge, where he graduated Fifth Wrangler in 1853, and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1857, having in the previous May obtained an open studentship. He practises on the South-Eastern Circuit, and he became a Queen's Counsel in 1874. Mr. Cohen is a bencher of the Inner Temple, judge of the Cinque Ports, and one of the counsel to the University of Cambridge.

Mr. HORACE DAVEY, Q.C., who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Christchurch in the Liberal interest, is the son of Mr. Davey, of Hineton, Buckinghamshire, and was born in 1833. He was educated at Rugby, and he was formerly Fellow of University College, Oxford, where he graduated double first (classics and mathematics) in 1856, and he obtained the Johnson Mathematical Scholarship in 1857, the Senior Mathematical Scholarship in 1858, and the Eldon Law Scholarship in 1859. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Hilary Term, 1861, and he became a Queen's Counsel in 1877. Mr. Davey practises in the Rolls Court. He is a bencher of Lincoln's-inn, and standing counsel to the University of Oxford.

Mr. WILLIAM DAVIES, the newly-elected Liberal member for Pembrokeshire, is the senior member of the firm of Davies & Co., of Haverfordwest, and 1a, Frederick's-place, Old Jewry, London. Mr. Davies is a justice of the peace, and deputy-lieutenant of Pembrokeshire, and a justice of Haverfordwest. He contested the county in the Liberal interest in 1876, but, as the ballot was then comparatively unknown, was unsuccessful. The county of Pembroke has not been represented by a Liberal for the last two hundred years.

Sir ANDREW FAIRBAIRN, Knight, who has been elected M.P. for the Eastern Division of the West Riding of Yorkshire in the Liberal interest, is the son of Sir Peter Fairbairn, of Leeds, and was born in 1828. He was educated at St. Peter's College, Cambridge, where he graduated as a wrangler in 1850. He practised for several years on the Northern Circuit, and at the West Riding and Leeds Sessions, and he was mayor of Leeds in 1866 and 1867. He was knighted in 1868 on the opening by the Prince of Wales of the Leeds Art Exhibition. Sir A. Fairbairn is a magistrate for Leeds and for the West Riding of Yorkshire, and he was chairman of the Leeds School Board from 1870 till 1878.

Mr. CYRIL FLOWER, barrister, who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Brecon in the Liberal interest, is the eldest son of Mr. Philip William Flower, of Streatham, and was born in 1843. He was educated at Harrow, and is an M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1870, and was a member of the Norfolk Circuit.

Mr. EDWARD WILLIAM HOLLOND, barrister, who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Brighton in the Liberal interest, is the second son of the Rev. Edmund Hollond, of Benhall Lodge, Suffolk, and was born in 1843. He was educated at Harrow and at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated as a junior optime in 1863. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1866, and is a member of the Midland Circuit.

Mr. WILLIAM THACKERAY MARRIOTT, Q.C., who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Brighton in the Liberal interest, is the son of Mr. Christopher Marriott, of Crumpsall, Manchester, and was born in 1834. He is a graduate of St. John's College, Cambridge, and he was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Hilary Term, 1864. He is a member of the South-Eastern Circuit, and he has also practised at the Parliamentary bar.

Mr. CHARLES BENJAMIN BRIGHT McLAREN, barrister, who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Stafford in the Liberal interest, is the third son of Mr. Duncan McLaren, M.P. for Edinburgh. He was born in 1849, and is an M.A.

of the University of Edinburgh. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1874, and practises on the Home Circuit.

Mr. JOHN McLAREN, advocate, who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Wigtown in the Liberal interest, is the eldest son of Mr. Duncan McLaren, M.P. for Edinburgh. He was born in 1831, and was educated at the University of Edinburgh. He was called to the bar in Scotland in 1856, and for several years held the office of Sheriff of Chancery in Scotland.

Mr. ALEXANDER HENRY ROSS, barrister, who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Maidstone in the Conservative interest, is the son of Mr. Charles Ross, M.P., and was born in 1829. He is an M.A. of Christ Church, Oxford. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1854, and he is a magistrate for Middlesex.

Mr. WALTER MOLESWORTH ST. AUBYN, barrister, who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Helston in the Conservative interest, is the third son of the Rev. Hender Molesworth St. Aubyn, of Clowance, Cornwall, and was born in 1838. He was educated at Christchurch, Oxford, and he was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Trinity Term, 1863. He practises on the Western Circuit, and also at the Central Criminal Court, and at the Devonshire, Exeter, Plymouth, and Devonport Sessions. Mr. St. Aubyn has acted as a revising barrister, and he is prosecuting counsel to the Mint for Devonshire.

Mr. HUGH SHIELD, who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Cambridge in the Liberal interest, is the second son of Mr. John Shield, of Stotes Hall, near Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and was born in 1831. He is a fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, where he graduated in the first class of the classical tripos in 1854. He was also placed in the first class in the moral sciences tripos in 1855, and he obtained the Chancellor's medal for legal studies in 1857. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple at Gray's-inn in Hilary Term, 1860, when he obtained an open studentship, and he practised on the North-Eastern Circuit.

The Hon. EDWARD LUTPUL STANLEY, barrister, who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Oldham in the Liberal interest, is the third son of the second Lord Stanley of Alderley, and was born in 1839. He was educated at Eton, and was formerly fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, where he graduated first class in classics in 1861. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1865, and he is a member of the Northern Circuit. Mr. Stanley is a member of the School Board for London for the Marylebone Division.

Mr. THOMAS CHARLES THOMPSON, barrister, who has been elected M.P. for the city of Durham in the Liberal interest, is the only son of Mr. Thomas Thompson, of Fawcett House, Durham, and was born in 1821. He was educated at Harrow and at the University of Durham, and he was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Easter Term, 1844. Mr. Thompson is a magistrate for the county of Durham. He was elected M.P. for the city of Durham in 1874, but was afterwards unseated on petition.

Mr. CHARLES NICHOLAS WARTON, barrister, who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Bridport in the Conservative interest, is the eldest son of the late Mr. Charles Warton, of Burwash, Sussex, and was born in 1832. He was educated at University College School and at Clare College, Cambridge. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Trinity Term, 1861, and is a member of the South-Eastern Circuit.

Mr. WILLIAM WILLIS, LL.D., Q.C., who has been elected M.P. for the borough of Colchester in the Liberal interest, is the son of Mr. William Willis, of Luton, and was born in 1835. He was educated at Huddersfield College, and is an LL.D. of the University of London, where he obtained the gold medal in 1865. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1861, having in the previous November obtained an open studentship, and he is a member of the South-Eastern Circuit. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1877, and he is a bencher of the Middle Temple.

Companies.

WINDING-UP NOTICES.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ARTIFICIAL COLOUR PRINTING COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up presented Apr. 5, directed to be heard before the M.R., on April 17. Wilkinson and Hewlett, Bedford-street, Covent Garden, solicitors for the petitioners.

NORMANTON IRON AND STEEL COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up presented Apr. 7, directed to be heard before the M.R., on April 17. Singleton and Tattershall, Great James st, agents for Harrison and Beaumont, Wakefield, solicitors for the petitioning company.

SOUTH DORSETH SLATE QUARRY COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up presented Apr. 8, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall, on April 16. Robinson and Co, Gracechurch st, solicitors for the petitioner.

TRIMLEY HALL LIME WORKS AND CARRGWELE SAND QUARRIES, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up presented Apr. 12, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall, on April 23. Hamlin and Grammer, Staple Inn, agents for Cartwright, Chester, solicitor for the petitioner. [Gazette, Apr. 9.]

ELGAR SILVER LEAD MINING COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by the M.R. dated Apr. 6, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Blackland and Son, Lincoln's Inn fields, agents for Hughes and Sons, Aberystwith, solicitors for the petitioners.

TRADEERS' BANKING AND SUPPLY COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated Apr. 6, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Hindson-Miller and Vernon, Moorgate st, solicitors for the petitioner. [Gazette, Apr. 13.]

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

CLUNGUNFOED FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Kangaroo Inn, Aston-on-Clun, Salop. Apr. 10

Societies.

LAW LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

A meeting of the proprietors of the above society was held on Friday the 9th inst., at the offices, Fleet-street. Mr. FRANCIS THOMAS BIRCHAM presided, and there was a large attendance.

The CHAIRMAN, in moving the adoption of the report, alluded to the regret which he was sure must be felt at the loss which the directors had sustained through the death of Mr. Clement Francis, who was one of the directors. He thought that the fact that at the end of another quinquennium they were all gainers in proportion to the amount they had contributed to the society, for that was the rule adopted, was a matter for congratulation. He then recapitulated the manner in which it was proposed to deal with the profits, as explained in the report, and, in referring to the general results of the working of the society as therein set forth, remarked that they had paid upwards of 30 per cent. on the amount originally assured. Meetings would be held on the 23rd and 30th of the month to confirm the result of their proceedings that day, and early in May, therefore, the policy-holders would have been credited with the amount of the reversionary bonus due to them, and the proprietors would have received their dividend in the shape of cash. With regard to the modifications which had been made, it was found that the society lost young lives by the high premium which was required, as they were acting, as late as 1875, upon the tables upon which they commenced operations in 1823. A committee of the directors was appointed, and they had the able and satisfactory advice of their own actuaries upon the subject, but did not feel it necessary to go beyond him before arriving at the conclusion that a change ought to be made. These tables worked well, but there was no great departure from those formerly in use. He hoped that he who might address them five years hence would be able to tell them as good a story as that to which they had now listened. They were a proprietary office, and no doubt one of the burdens they had to bear was to contend against mutual offices, which proposed to give better profits. Proprietors should be the agents and creators of the business, and he was afraid that it was the extent of their success which made them a little lethargic. There was not a sufficient accretion of business. They held their own, but did not get that increase which, by the exertion

of the proprietors, they might and should have. They had a great struggle with one feature, which was doing much to attract business to inferior offices—viz., the scale of commissions. He had himself received a circular offering him 15 per cent. on the amount assured, and 5 per cent. on life renewals. They could not compete with that sort of thing, but if the proprietors would only do however little to endeavour to increase business, they could do more than these agents ever succeeded in effecting for the offices they represented. On the part of his colleagues and himself he could promise to devote all the attention they could to the society's affairs and the proprietors themselves must promise some attention to their own interests.

Mr. JOHN SWIFT seconded the adoption of the report.

Mr. PADDON suggested whether annual bonuses could not be paid.

Mr. WALTERS pointed out that it would be impossible to have an annual bonus without an annual valuation. He thought that the £10,000 which had been set apart as a suspense fund should be divided. If it were retained as an extra guarantee it was a mere fleabite, but it was equivalent to £1 per share. He would move an amendment that this sum be divided.

Mr. PADDON said he would second it.

Mr. BEDDOME also supported the proposition, remarking that the society had ample means of securing everybody to the fullest extent.

The CHAIRMAN said that with regard to the question of an annual bonus, that was inquired into some years ago, and with every disposition to entertain it, the directors found that there were considerable legal difficulties in the matter, and practically a reason against it was, that in making annual valuations they would have to deal with fluctuating circumstances, but if spread over five years the averages could be taken. With regard to the £10,000, if it should please the proprietors to recommend that this sum be divided with the £12 they were about to receive, he would suggest that it should not be an amendment, but should be in the form of a recommendation, which the directors would treat as a command and act upon accordingly.

The report was then adopted.

Mr. WALTERS then moved, and Mr. PADDON seconded, "That the proprietors recommend the directors that the £10,000 in the guarantee fund, proposed to be retained as a protective suspense fund, be divided among the proprietors with the amount of bonus proposed in the report."

The motion was carried, and a vote of thanks to Mr. Davis and his colleagues, and to the chairman and other directors, terminated the meeting.

Law Students' Journal.

COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION.

EASTER AND TRINITY COURSE OF LECTURES, 1880.

Prospectus of the Lectures of the Professors.

The Professor of Roman Law will deliver, during the ensuing educational term, a course of six lectures on the Roman law of contracts.

The first lecture of this course will be delivered on Monday, the 12th of April, 1880, at 3.15 p.m. The subsequent lectures will be delivered on Thursdays and Mondays at the same hour.

NOTE.—The lectures will be suspended after Thursday, the 29th of April, and be resumed on Monday, the 31st of May, at 3 p.m.

JURISPRUDENCE.

The Professor of Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law, and Legal History will, during the ensuing educational term, deliver eight lectures on leading cases and debates in constitutional law.

The first lecture of this course will be delivered on Monday, the 31st of May, 1880, at 3 p.m., and the subsequent lectures at the same hour on Thursdays and Mondays.

EQUITY.

The Professor of Equity will, during the ensuing educational term, deliver a course of twelve lectures upon "The application of equity to the subjects in which, previous to

the 1st of November, 1875, it operated as auxiliary to or corrective of common law."

The first lecture will be delivered on Friday, the 9th of April, 1880, at 4.15 p.m., and the subsequent lectures at the same hour on Wednesdays and Fridays.

NOTE.—The lectures in this subject will be suspended after Wednesday, the 28th of April, and be resumed on Wednesday, the 2nd of June, at the usual hour.

LAW OF REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY.

The Professor of the Law of Real and Personal Property will deliver, during the ensuing educational term, twelve lectures on the following subject:—The law of executors and administrators.

The first lecture will be delivered on Saturday, the 10th of April, 1880, at 3.15 p.m.

The subsequent lectures on this subject will be delivered on Tuesdays at 4.15 p.m., and Saturdays at 3.15 p.m.

NOTE.—The lectures in this subject will be suspended after Tuesday, the 27th of April, and be resumed on Tuesday, the 1st of June, at the usual hour.

COMMON LAW.

The Professor of Common Law will deliver, during the ensuing educational term, twelve lectures on charter-party and bills of lading.

The first lecture will be delivered on Monday, the 12th of April, 1880, at 4.15 p.m.

The subsequent lectures on this subject will be delivered on Thursdays and Mondays at the same hour.

NOTE.—The lectures in this subject will be suspended after Thursday, the 29th of April, and be resumed on Thursday, the 3rd of June, at the usual hour.

EASTER EXAMINATION, 1880.

GENERAL EXAMINATION OF STUDENTS OF THE INNS OF COURT, held at Lincoln's-inn Hall, on the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th of March, 1880.

The Council of Legal Education have awarded to the following students certificates that they have satisfactorily passed a public examination:—Syud Abdur-Bahman, Edmund Wilson Baroes, Henry Conway Belfield, Christoffel Joseph Brand, John Kendall Brooke, William Fowler Carter, Edward Cunliffe-Owen, William Daniell, Thomas Edward Ellison, John Blackburn Ferguson, Paul Henry Foley, William Ford-Kelcey, Henry Archibald Forman, Walter Frith, John Digby Gordon, Frederick Arthur Hyndman, Edward Allvey Jennings, James Gordon Jones, Rudolf Chambers Lehman, Anyas Philip Longstaffe, Francis Lowrey, Frederick Mote, Leonard Gaskell Pike, Charles Marston Rose, Peary Lall Roy, Charles Lionel Sanders, Hugh Francis Seymour, Joseph Smith, Henry Reynolds Solly, Edwin Francis Scudamore Stanhope, St. John Stephen, Galfrid Henry James Tayleur, Louis Stephen White, John Wingfield, and Edward John Eveleigh Wyndham, of the Inner Temple; Jerome Alberga, Sidney Adolphus Boyd, Francis Leicester Butler, Ulic Emmanuel E. Charlton, John George Cox, Archibald James Forman, Oliver Armstrong Fry, Julius Berkeley Hallé, William Edward Johnston, John Walter Jones, Lewis Levy, Edward Armfield Marrow, Charles Newton, Robert Colin Ringrose, Geoffrey Peter St. Aubyn, Harry Fiennea Speed, and Robert Armstrong Yerburgh, of the Middle Temple; Wyndham Anstis Bewes, William Craddock Bolland, Arthur Christopher Capel, Ralph Hawtreay Deane, Edward Russell James Gambeir-Howe, Mohammed Hussein Hakim, Henry Hobhouse, Thomas Raffles Hughes, Charles James Blackburn Lowe, Frank Alexander Milne, Krishna Nath Mitra, Samuel Moss, Charles Norris Nicholson, George Frederick Reunien, and John Hartley Sandwith, of Lincoln's-inn, Esqs.

The following students passed a satisfactory examination in Roman law:—Wilfred Brinton, Henry Herbert Browell, Joseph Yelverton Dawbarn, Arthur Denman, George Eliott, Herman Erohisen, Charles Frederick Goss, Sir John Alexander Hanham, Percy Ambrose Sewell Hickie, Henry Gordon Jeffreson, Charles Moore Kennedy, George Soames Layard, William Llewellyn, James Challenor Lynch, William Henry MacGeorge, Henry Gordon Mackenzie, Bannatyne Macleod, Hon. John William Mansfield, George St. John Midway, James Mason Mulgan, William Charles Niblett, John Henry Peartree, Arthur Pierre Poley, Walter John Deacon Radcliffe, Ross Jenkin Rhys, Montague Shearman, John Frederick Symons-Jeune,

Cecil Arthur Tennant, Thomas Marchant Williams, Howell Wills, and Walter Biddwyn Yates, of the Inner Temple; John Thomas Blaze, Arthur Travers Fawcett, Richard Thomas Higgins, Clarendon George Hyde, Henry Hamilton Lawless, Michael John Michael, Reginald Cantley Saunders, William Thomas, Thomas Arthur Wallis, Valentine Hussey Walsh, and Arthur Thomas Winn, of the Middle Temple; Edwin Ffoulkes Ball, Edward Sumner Bird, Henry James Broun, John Henry Chapman, Maurice Des Graz, John Duthie, Charles Gregson Ellis, Harry Trelawney Eve, William Bates Ferguson, William Dunn Gainsford, Thomas Oliver Harding, Arthur Moss Lawrence, John Wanklyn McConnell, Samuel Moore, Henry William Hayes Redwar, and Robert Forsyth Scott, of Lincoln's-inn, Esqs.

By order of the Council,

(Signed)

S. H. WALPOLE, Chairman.

Council Chamber, Lincoln's-inn, April 5.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held at Clement's-inn Hall on the 7th inst. The Cardiff Law Students' Society was admitted into union. The secretary's report for the last quarter was read and adopted. Mr. Rawlings then opened the subject for debate—"That the union between Church and State should be abolished"—in the affirmative, and was supported by Mr. J. Ashton Cross, while Messrs. R. B. D. Acland, N. Synnott, G. White, C. Parsons, and Eustace Smith opposed. Mr. Whitehouse then proposed, and Mr. R. G. Templer seconded, the adjournment of the debate until Wednesday next, when it is hoped that the attendance of members will be large.

The following is the report of the hon. secretary for the quarter ending March 31:—

I beg to lay before you my report for the quarter ending March 31, which will, I trust, prove satisfactory to you.

Ten meetings have been held at Clement's-inn Hall for the purposes of debate. The average attendance at these meetings has been twenty-six, which is in advance of the average in former years. The discussions have been generally animated, and there has been a marked increase in the number of members both willing and anxious to speak. From the subjects discussed I have selected the following, as having excited the keenest interest:—A motion approving of the action of the Incorporated Law Society and Inns of Court in excluding women from their examinations, which was lost by two votes; a motion condemning the execution of military prisoners in Afghanistan, which was carried by two votes; a motion proposing to establish a school of law for the joint education of bar students and articled clerks, which was carried by two votes; a motion that Lord Beaconsfield and his Government do not deserve the confidence of the country, which, after being twice adjourned, was finally carried by a majority of two.

Thirty new members have been elected at these meetings, of whom three were barristers, four solicitors, nine bar students, twelve articled clerks, and two members of societies in union with your society.

On the 14th of January the James Prize was announced as having been awarded to your secretary by Mr. Montague Cookson, Q.C., who had kindly consented to act as umpire; the essay sent in by Mr. T. Eustace Smith being highly commended.

On the 4th of February Mr. E. H. Quicke, then secretary for the societies in union, brought forward a motion for giving a second prize of three guineas, in addition to the one now existing, at the annual competition for the Union Prize. The motion was carried.

On the 25th of February, Mr. Farrer Herschell, Q.C. M.P., presided at the inaugural meeting of the society, and was supported by distinguished members of both branches of the profession. We are, I think, justified in considering the meeting as having been again this year a decided success.

On the 3rd of March Mr. W. Dowson was appointed secretary for societies in union in the place of Mr. E. H. Quicke, resigned. I feel confident that you will, in common with the various societies in union, be unanimous in regretting the retirement of an officer who has been indefatigably conscientious in the management of the affairs of his department.

Six meetings have been held at the Law Institution, which have, I consider, been marked by improvement, both in attendance and arguments; a paper is to be read this month on the Law of Infants, by Mr. C. Kains-Jackson, and your committee feel that the society would be much indebted to any other

gentleman who would undertake to read similar papers at these meetings.

The other departments of the society are, I understand, in fair working order. W. C. OWEN, Hon. Sec.

On Wednesday night the adjourned debate on the Disestablishment question was brought to a conclusion by a vote in favour of the present union between Church and State being maintained. The advocates of Disestablishment at the adjourned debate were Messrs. Mott-Whitehouse, Pain, Rundle Levy, and Beaumont Morrice; its opponents, Messrs. St. John Mildmay, Bateman Napier, Kains-Jackson, Harvey, Robinson, and Maxwell. There was a good attendance, and the debate was not concluded until a late hour.

BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held on Tuesday, April 6, in the Law Library, Mr. W. S. Allen in the chair. A vote of thanks was passed to Mr. W. Showell Rogers for his valuable services as hon. treasurer and hon. secretary of the society. After the election of several members and the addition of books to the library, a debate took place on the following moot point:—"A testator bequeaths a share of residue to A. with a gift over to B. on the death of A., 'without having actually received his share, whether the same shall have become due and payable or not.' Is the gift over to B. valid?"—*Martin v. Martin* (14 W. R. 986); *Minors v. Battison* (25 W. R. 27); *Johnson v. Crook* (28 W. R. 12); *Collison v. Barber* (L. R. 12 Ch. D. 834); *Bubb v. Padwick* (28 W. R. 382). The speakers in the affirmative were Messrs. Rogers, Hayes, Mason, Samuel, and O'Connor, and on the negative Messrs. Ludlow, Dennison, and Crookford. After a few remarks from the chairman, the question was put and decided in the affirmative by a large majority. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the meeting.

At a meeting of this society held on Tuesday evening last, in the Law Library, the first of a series of lectures, kindly promised to the society by several barristers and solicitors of the town, was given by N. Nathan, Esq., B.A., barrister-at-law. The subject of the lecture was "Considerations on the Assimilation of the Law of Real and Personal Property." The learned gentleman carefully indicated the material distinctions between real and personal property, and having severely criticised the various anomalies existing in the law of real property and the present system of conveyancing, pointed out how the assimilation of the law of real to personal property in the manner suggested by him would be instrumental in causing their removal. Mr. Nathan then proceeded to consider the subject in its legal, social, and political aspect, and brought his very able and interesting lecture to a close. A vote of thanks to Mr. Nathan was proposed by the honorary secretary (Mr. F. Harvey Samuel), seconded by Mr. W. Showell Rogers, and enthusiastically carried.

LIVERPOOL LAW STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION.

A meeting of this association was held at the Law Library, Union-court, on the 5th inst., W. F. Wilson, Esq., solicitor, in the chair. It was decided that the paper on "General Average," read at the previous meeting by Mr. Richard Lowndes, should, with his permission, be printed and circulated at the expense of this association. A letter was read from Mr. F. J. Leslie, resigning the post of honorary secretary, which he had held since 1877, on the ground that he found himself unable any longer to devote sufficient time to the performance of the duties of the office. Mr. T. S. Mills, B.A. (in the absence of Mr. E. H. Blenso), opened the debate in the affirmative on the following subject appointed for discussion:—"A testator by his will bequeathed all the residue of his estate to A. with a gift over to B. 'in case A. shall die before he shall have actually received the same.' A dies fourteen months after the death of the testator, without having actually received any part of such residue. Is A.'s legal representative entitled to the bequest?" Mr. J. J. K. Mills, supported the negative view of the question, and the debate was continued by Messrs. Leslie, McMaster, Dawbarn, and Hannay. The case chiefly relied on for the affir-

mative was *Johnson v. Crook* (28 W. R. 12), and for the negative *Collison v. Barber* (L. R. 12 Ch. D. 834), and *Bubb v. Padwick* (28 W. R. 382). Mr. Mills having replied, the question was put to the meeting and decided in the negative by a majority of one.

PRACTICAL ADVICE TO LAW STUDENTS.

Mr. A. S. Watson, president of the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Law Society, at the opening of the newly-established law classics in that town, delivered an address, in the course of which he said:—

It may not be altogether uninteresting to my hearers if I briefly tell them the course of reading which I was put through as an articled clerk eight-and-twenty years ago. I do not doubt that many of my contemporaries went through a better course, and derived great benefit from it, but I was anxious to learn and read hard. An excellent lawyer and one highly esteemed by his brethren, who has now retired from practice, undertook, of his own free will, to chalk me out the plan which I should adopt. My first book was "Euclid," a work of which some of you perhaps may never have heard, and which I can tell you but little about. So far as I remember it consisted of a series of conversations on the principles of the law of real property. When it had been mastered, I proceeded to "Coke upon Littleton," "Sheppard's Touchstone," and "Fearn's on Contingent Remainders," in the order named, with "Blackstone's Commentaries" when I had time to indulge in light reading. Alas! in those days there was no intermediate examination to prevent the possibility of so much mental torture. The works I have mentioned are great works truly—great, most of them, in every sense of the word—but three weary years were all insufficient for their mastery, and I found myself in the melancholy condition of one who has been required to gallop before he was able to walk.

The requirements of the intermediate examination have made for you, happy students, such a course of reading impossible, and the classes we inaugurate to-day are to aid you in passing that examination with credit and satisfaction to yourselves.

Your readers will perhaps forgive me if I proceed to a few general considerations upon the study of the law, which spring naturally out of what has been already said.

Most of you probably have heard a song which is at the present time justly popular, and in which a successful lawyer relates the method of his success. Carry your minds back to the last two lines of the first verse of that song, which runs

"I polished up that handle so careful
That now I'm the ruler of the Queen's Nave."

The secret of all success is contained in those two lines. He must be faithful in small matters who wishes to have greater intrusted to him. It is thoroughness which is the chief element of success in study as in nearly all the affairs of life. It is this which is most to be cultivated; and to form the habit of doing that which falls to you to be done thoroughly should be your constant aim. We cannot all have genius, but we can all be thorough, which is far better. Thoroughness is made up of patience and perseverance rightly applied.

It is not so important to read much, as to read that which you do read thoroughly. Do not merely read it—master it. Understand every word. Leave no sentence until it is really yours. You will find it by no means a bad plan to pull up at the end of each paragraph, and examine yourself upon it so as to see that you are reading with an open understanding. It is a mistake to read in the not uncommon "duty" fashion—to set yourself a certain number of pages a day which are to be gone through. The mind is apt to get into a careless and slovenly way, and to be satisfied with accomplishing the regulation task with the eyes, leaving the understanding out in the cold. But that which is read in such a fashion is not merely worthless, it is much worse than worthless. It is like the food which is taken into the body beyond that which can be properly assimilated. It is not simply valueless; it is absolutely hurtful.

Do not be afraid of confessing your ignorance. In a study like that of the law, which has many branches, each with

innumerable ramifications, we have all from time to time to confess our ignorance. The oldest and ablest practitioner amongst us will not hesitate to confirm me when I say that a week seldom passes in which he has not occasion to refer to that which is outside of his own knowledge. Besides, in dealing with the law, we have at times to deal with an uncertain, at times with an unknown quantity. Complications arise which have never before presented themselves; questions are asked upon special or out-of-the-way subjects, and authorities have to be consulted; inferences have to be drawn; you have to argue from the known to the unknown; or you have to acquire knowledge which you did not previously possess. If you do not understand a thing, say so, and ask about it. This is one of the great advantages of intelligent instruction. The teacher is, as I have said, a living book. You can explain the difficulties you have met with in your reading to him; can tell him the points which he has not made clear to you; and can have your difficulties and your ignorance removed.

I have dwelt rather fully upon this, for it is a point of great importance. I have seen a number of students sit through a lecture as though all that was said was plain to them, until some one ventured to put a question and so elicit explanations for which all were thankful.

Again, let me strongly advise you to be most anxious in your study of the law, to become acquainted with the great principles upon which all law is founded. Mere practice must, of course, be learned, but it is best learned in the practical work of the office. The details of the law must also be learned, but they should always be learned in immediate connection with the principles from which they spring. It is not the point itself; it is its why and wherefore which is of the most importance to you; for all true law must be founded upon abiding principles. The true method of applying those principles may not always be understood in the same way; mistakes in their application may be and are made, but the principles are fixed and immutable. Practice, as I have already pointed out, is constantly changing; change is one of its natural incidents; but a principle once thoroughly mastered is your servant for life.

When Louis Napoleon was Emperor of the French he sent over commissioners to examine into the state of our public schools. They reported, amongst other things, that in the highest form at Eton, all the youths were able to repeat whole books of Euclid by heart, but that they found scarcely one who could work the simplest exercise upon the earliest problems. The man who reads cases, and learns points, without acquainting himself with the principles from which they spring and upon which they depend, is in the position of the youths who were the admiration of the French Commissioners.

If I were to combine the two points I have mentioned, the thoroughness and the grasp of principles, and to educe two other practical pieces of advice from them, I should say "come to your conclusions slowly," and "aim at taking broad and comprehensive views."

"Come to your conclusions slowly." Have all the facts before you first. Look all round the matters you have to advise upon before you speak. Do not jump to conclusions. Take nothing for granted. Think before you speak, and the more you think and the less you speak the better.

"Aim at taking broad and comprehensive views." This is a life-long struggle with most solicitors who attend to it at all. Our practice, our professional success, are opposed to it. We have to learn intense concentration of mind, but we have also to learn how to concentrate the mind upon one thing after another with the greatest rapidity. After a busy day, a solicitor's mind is not unlike a kaleidoscope. He has taken one thing after another into it all day long, casting each away when done with; and at the end it is filled with a mass of dimly-remembered subjects which cannot be quite cleared away, but which unfit it for everything else. But the most important matters he is consulted upon require broader treatment, and he flies to counsel for that which Nature gave him also, but art has destroyed. Happy the man who can retain this invaluable faculty of breadth of view whilst he also obtains the power of the rapid and frequent change of mental objects.

But you must not imagine that, when you have passed the preliminary examination, your general education is complete and your technical education alone remains. It is of much importance, not only for your own happiness,

but also for your professional usefulness, that you should continue your general education. It is impossible for me, in the brief space at my disposal, to go adequately into this subject of general education, but I may just allude to the acquisition of foreign languages. From any high educational standpoint they occupy a very low position. They are not properly education, in any advanced sense, any more than reading, writing, and ciphering are education. They are simply the tools by the use of which you may become educated. But, from a professional point of view, they are very valuable. Now-a-days there is no branch of knowledge which will come amiss to a solicitor. It is quite impossible to lay your finger upon any subject with which, sooner or later, some member of our profession will not have to deal. And with the immense extension of commerce, and the vast increase in the means of locomotion, every day new fields of practice are opened out. Mines in Spain; villas in Switzerland; railways in Sicily; estates in America; islands in the Southern Pacific; mineral concessions in France; forests in Sweden; orchards in the Lebanon; vineyards in Hungary; fisheries in Norway; all of these have actually been dealt with by firms of solicitors in Newcastle within the past ten years. You will find the time and labour spent in the acquisition of foreign languages a profitable investment. And far beyond any pecuniary benefit is the power you thus acquire of entering into sympathy with people other than your own—of conversing with the great minds of many lands. "So many languages as a man knows, so often is he a man."

I need not enlarge upon the relaxation which is afforded to men, whose employment is an intellectual and a harassing one, by pursuits which are outside the scope of their daily occupations. It is of the greatest value to us all to have some hobby in which we can profitably occupy that leisure time, which becomes increasingly small as the years roll on. And in such pursuits there is great reward, as well as the truest relaxation. There is no branch of human learning in which the patient humble worker cannot be of actual use to his fellow-men. In all alike there will ever be good honest work to be done by those who are ready and willing to undertake it. There is no need to have all work and no play. Most of us do not play nearly enough, but still more of us neglect the great opportunities which present themselves for useful work outside our professional labours—work in which minds trained and disciplined as those of lawyers should be—may be of peculiar value.

For, gentlemen, you are not merely to be lawyers, you are to be members of that mighty organization, the State, and to the State, from which he receives everything, each man owes the best which he can give.

One word more and I have done. You are learning now in order that you may become members of a great and important profession. You are to be the repositories of secrets, the healers or makers of feuds, the advisers of your fellow-men for good or for evil. Look upon your profession as a sacred trust, not simply as a money-making machine; upon your professional brethren as your friends, not as your rivals. Do not for a moment imagine that the best lawyer is he who can practise the most dodges, and can most skilfully over-reach his fellow-practitioners. Ours ought to be, must be, is, a truly honourable profession. It will be yours in time to come to uphold its honour. It will be yours to preserve that high standard which has here, in my humble opinion, been so long maintained. It will be yours in loyalty to this society, which is doing what it can to help you, to support it and to extend its usefulness. It will be yours to keep up that warm, friendly, honourable feeling which has ever existed amongst the practitioners here, and which has so greatly contributed to the welfare, not only of the members of our profession, but also of those who place their confidence in us, and intrust their dearest interests to our keeping. I can imagine no calling more truly honourable than that of a solicitor rightly fulfilled. We hear from time to time much talk about the *status* of our profession. That *status* must and ought to depend upon the true, honest, upright conduct of its members. A solicitor must believe in duty; he must understand self-sacrifice; he must be one who sweareth to his own hurt, when occasion requires it, and altereth not. In this movement to give you better opportunities than we ourselves enjoyed to become fitted for the proper exercise of the high and important functions to which, in due time, you will be called, you have the warmest and truest sympathy of us all.

Young men, the honour and welfare of our profession will be committed, in a manner, to your charge. See to it, that you prove yourselves worthy of your vocation.

Creditors' Claims.

CREDITORS UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY. LAST DAY OF PROOF.

COPLAND, MAXWELL, Liverpool, Draper. Apr 27. Copland v Copland, M.R. France, Wigan
LLEWELIN, JOHN, Saundersfoot, Pembroke, Innkeeper. May 1. Llewelin v Collins, M.R. Lock, Tenby
MACHU, JOHN HENRY, Tulse Hill, Esq. Apr 30. Florence v Florence, V.C. Hall. Turner and Low, King st, Cheapside
ROBERTS, GEORGE, Oxford st, Ladies' Outfitter. May 1. Roberts v Roberts, V.C. Malins. Morgan, Somerset st, Portman sq. [Gazette, Mar. 30.]

LAKER, MARY ANN, Billingham, Innkeeper. Apr 30. Lakor v Laker V.C. Hall. Child and Son, South sq, Gray's Inn
MINTER, DAVID, Forest Gate, Grocer. Apr 30. Batten v Minter, V.C. Malins. Steele, College hill
STONE, JULIA MAILDA, Radpole, Weymouth. Apr 24. Stone v Stone, V.C. Malins. Walters, New sq, Lincoln's inn [Gazette, Apr. 2.]

LEACROFT, EDWARD, Southwell, Notts. Esq. Apr 30. Leacroft v Harward, V.C. Hall. Leech and Co, Derby [Gazette, Apr. 6.]

CREDITORS UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 25. LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

BENNETT, ABRAHAM, Penzance, Gent. May 1. Trythall, Penzance
BOND, ROBERT, Thornton-in-Craven, York, Farmer. May 1. Bantlett and Son, Selby
CARTER, GEORGE JAMES, Vanston pl, Walham Green, Gent. May 1. Arnold and Co, Carey st, Lincoln's-inn
COATES, CHARLES HENRY, Manchester, Stock and Share Broker. April 20. Heywood and Son, Manchester
DALTON, JAMES, Great Grimsby, Publican. April 20. Haddelsey and Haddelsey, Great Grimsby
FRANCE, GEORGE JOHNSON, Duke st, Manchester sq, Picture Dealer. May 4. Eurgoyne and Co, Oxford st
GODDER, MARY, Kabbato della Citia Notabile, Malta. April 22. Simpson and North, Liverpool
GUTTERSON, SIR ALEXANDER WILLIAM, Southsea, Hants, Bart. June 1. Hellard and Son, Portsmouth
HALLIDAY, ABRAHAM SMITHSON, Halifax, Brewer. June 1. Emmet and Walker, Halifax
HIGGS, JOHN, Chipping Sodbury, Gloucester, Yeoman. May 8. Trenfield, Chipping Sodbury
JOHNSON, WILLIAM, Cawthorne, York, Farmer. June 1. Marshall and Owensworth, Barnsley
JONES, SAREY, Surbiton, Surrey, Grocer. April 30. Bell, Kingston-on-Thames
LONGMAN, HENRY, Boston st, Dorset sq, Corn Merchant. May 23. Campbell and Co, Warwick st, Regent st
MYER, MYER, Linden gardens, Kensington, Esq. May 31. Phelps and Co, Gresham st
MILLS, RICHARD, St Paul's rd, Camden sq, Shipwright. May 15. Carr, and Co, Rood lane
PARLETT, JOHN, Peter-field, Southampton, Manager of the London and County Bank. May 15. Parlett, Chancery lane
PARRY, ROBERT, Liverpool, Coiliery Proprietor. April 28. Wright and Co, Liverpool
POOT, FANNY MARIA, Harlow, Essex. May 1. Alfred Pool, Stalybridge
SCOTT, The Most Noble WILLIAM JOHN CAVENDISH BENTINCK, Duke of Portland, Cavendish-square. May 20. Baileys and Co, Berners-st
POTTS, JOHN, Loughborough, Leicester, Labourer. May 7. Deane and Hands, Loughborough
RAYNES, ROBERT, Seaton st, Chelsea, Builder. May 4. Emmott, Budge row, Cannon st
RIMNES, NICHOLAS, Southport, Lancaster, Cab Proprietor. May 1. Threlfall, Southport
SOPWITH, HENRY LINDSELL, Tunbridge Wells, Surgeon. May 28. Burton, Tunbridge Wells
SPOR, JAMES, Northampton, Tailor. May 1. Middleton, Dunstable
WILKINSON, JOSEPH, Queensbury, Halifax, Yeoman. June 1. Emmet and Walker, Halifax [Gazette, Mar. 26.]

BROWN, DAVID, Chesterfield, Derby, Draper. May 29. Bunting, Chesterfield
CONNER, SIMON, Waterloo rd, Licensed Victualler. May 10. Sillemann and Neate, Southampton st, Bloomsbury sq
CHAUFUUD, ROBERT, Gt. Malvern, Worcester, Esq. May 15. Withall and Crampton, Gt George st, Westminster
DALE, JOSEPH LANGHAM, Furnival's-inn, Holborn, Solicitor. May 1. Hales, Chancery-lane
DAY Y, JAMES, Erskine-street, Liverpool. April 20. Lynch and Tebbay Liverpool
ECOLESTON, JOHN, Birmingham, Fishmonger. July 1. Cottrell and Son, Birmingham
FERGUSON, RICHARD BLOFIELD, Kingsgate-street, High Holborn, Dairyman. May 6. Easton, Clifford's-inn
PEARMAN, JAMES, Reading. April 20. Buckland, Kingston-on-Thames
SMITH, JOHN HOOTER, Lindfield, Sussex, Gent. May 10. Nye, Brighton

SYKES, EDWARD SWIFT, Llandudno, Carnarvon, Grocer. May 15. Minshalls and Co, Llandudno
TEASDALE, CUTHBERT, Prince of Wales rd, Kentish Town, Gent. April 30. Flux and Leadbitter, Leadenhall st
UTWY, SARAH, Nelson sq, Blackfriars rd. May 3. Crump and Son, Philipot-lane
WARD, LEWIS, Liverpool, Esq. May 15. Young and Co, St Mildred's cr, Toulury
WILD, JAMES, Pond st, Hampstead, Builder. May 12. Maynell, Castle-street, Holborn [Gazette, Mar 30.]

BIRCH, SIR THOMAS BERNARD, Hazles, Lancaster, Bart. June 1. Oliver and Sons, Lincoln's-inn
BOLL, HENRIETTA, Larkhall, Bath. May 5. Stone and Co, Bath
COOKE, MARGARET, Wood Ditton, Cambridge. May 1. Fenn, Newmarket
DUNGER, HENRY, Colney Hatch, Gent. July 1. Carew, Southampton st, Bloomsbury
GARTON, MARY, Hornsea, York. May 1. Eldridge and Stephenson, Hull
GILLET, WILLIAM, Bishopsworth, Somerset, Farmer. May 3. Tucker, Yatton
GODFREY, JOHN, Asington, Suffolk, Farmer. April 23. Andrewes and Co, Sudbury
HANMAN, ELIZABETH, Gloucester. April 14. Haines, Gloucester
HIGHAM, GEORGE, Kingston-upon-Hull, Builder. May 1. Rolitt and Marland, Elizabeth, Chesham, Manchester. May 15. Marlow, Manchester
ROBERTSON, ROBERT, Bishop's rd, Paddington, Cheesemonger. May 3. Carter and Bell, Eastcheap
SAVILL, SAMUEL WEBB, Boleyns, Essex, Esq. May 12. Holmes, Bocking
SHELLY, EDWARD HENRY, Leamington, Warwick, Gent. May 15. Bland, Nuneaton
SHELLY, ELIZA ANN, Leamington, Warwick. May 15. Bland, Nuneaton
SPENCER, THOMAS, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Leicester, Butcher. May 1. Fisher and Co, Ashby-de-la-Zouch
STRECKER, FREDERICK, Fenchurch-st, Tea Dealer. May 1. Van Sandau and Cumming, King st, Cheapside
STUBBS, JAMES, Aldershot, Southampton, Coach Builder. April 20. Price, Walbrook
TEASDALE, CUTHBERT, Prince of Wales' rd, Kentish Town, Gent. April 30. Flux and Leadbitter, Leadenhall st
THWAITE, JOHN, Thoraby, York, Farmer. April 30. Hammond, West Burton [Gazette, April 2.]

CHATBURN, MARY CLARISSA, West Hulton, Lincoln. June 24. Alderson and Co, Eghington
DAVIES, MARY, Kearsley st, Stoke Newington. May 15. Gowing and Co, Moorgate Station bldgs, Finsbury-pavement
DEWE, REV. GEORGE SMITH, Trinity Church, Lambeth. May 15. Pyke and Parrott, Lincoln's-inn-fields
ELLIOT, JOHN, Dinsdale, Durham, Gent. May 13. Kidson and Co, Sunderland
GRESWOLDE-WILLIAMS, LOUISA, Rock Ferry, Chester. May 1. Simpson and North, Liverpool
HAMILTON, AUGUSTUS TERRACE, Belgrave-mansions, Piccadilly, a Captain in Her Majesty's First Light Infantry. April 30. Williams and Co, Lincoln's-inn-fields
HASLER, JONATHAN, Deptford, Kent, Cowkeeper. May 17. Marchant and Purvis, George-yard, Lombard st
HATTON, GEORGE, Nately, Westmoreland. May 3. Preston, Kirby Stephen
HUNT, ORLANDO VANN, Leicester, Gent. June 1. Harris, Leicester
MOORHOUSE, JAMES, Forest of Rossendale, Lancaster, Cotton Manufacturer. May 6. Parker, Manchester
O'BRIEN, HANORAH, Wiesbaden, Germany. May 9. Kenny, Linerick
PARKES, DAVID, Wanstead, Essex, Gent. May 1. Van Sandau and Cumming, King st, Cheapside
PARSON, REV. RICHARD, Havlemore, Surrey, Clerk in Holy Orders. May 6. Hellard and Son, Portsmouth
PHEAR, HENRY CARLTON, New sq, Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law. June 1. Johnson and Co, Austin Friars
PULEN, HENRY, Horley, Surrey Farmer. May 18. Merriek Head, Reigate
RICK, FRANCIS, Shirley, Southampton. May 15. Newman, Southampton
SEAGER, HENRY, Gracechurch st, Timber Merchant. June 1. Parsons and Lee, Abchurch House, Broadway-lane
TURNER, SAYERS, Colchester, Essex, Gent. May 19. Turner and Co, Colchester
TYNDALL, WILLIAM, Liverpool, Gent. May 13. Tyndall and Paxton, North John st
VIGNE, EMMA, Waterloo-crescent, Dover. June 1. Johnson and Co, Austin Friars [Gazette, April 6.]

ASTON, ANN, Drayton terrace, Brompton. May 12. Rye and Eyre, Golden sq
BAILEY, WILLIAM, Kirk Langley, Derby, Gent. June 24. Hextall, Derby
BANKHEAD, WILLIAM JOHN COLDHAM, Maldon, Essex, Gent. June 3. Digby and Evans, Maldon
BARTON, THOMAS, Chorley, Lancaster, Cotton Spinner. June 24. Weston and Co, Manchester
BATES, JOSHUA, Throgmorton st, Stock and Share Broker. June 1. Radcliffe and Co, Craven st, Charing Cross
BRACE, JOHN, Lichfield, Solicitor. May 31. Birch, Lichfield
BRADCOCK, SAMUEL, Northgate, Clockheaton, York, Mechanic. May 12. Clough, Clockheaton
BURWAST, REV. FREDERICK GEORGE, Nursling, Southampton, Clerk in Holy Orders. June 1. Mee and Co, East Reiford

CARTWRIGHT, RICHARD, Hampton Wick. June 1. Sherrard, Lincoln's inn-fields
 CAUGHT, GILBERT, Ramsgate, Kent, Esq. July 6. Daniel, Emsgate
 COARIE, JAMES JOHNSTONE, Leeds, Surgeon. June 15. Rider, Leeds
 COURENS, ELI, Witley, Surrey, Gent. June 1. Mellersh, Godalming
 DAVIS, SAMUEL, Yardley, Worcester, Farmer. May 5. Simcox, Birmingham
 DIVER, THOMAS, Lavender Sweep, Battersea, Esq. May 20. Ford and Co, Bloomsbury sq
 EDWARDS, JANE, Newquay, Cornwall. May 29. Smith and Paul, Truro
 ELLIOTT, THOMAS FREDERICK, Onslow sq. Brompton- May 15. Ranken Ford, South sq, Gray's-inn
 GELDARD, MARIA, Elm-cottage, Teddington. May 6. Kayes and Jones, New-inn, Strand
 GREGSON, JOHN, Tadcaster, York, Esq. May 15. Lake and Co, New sq, Lincoln's-inn
 HIGGINS, GEORGE HENRY, Windsor-place, City rd, Mould Maker. May 24. Mills and Co, Brunswick pl
 HOFPAT, ERNEST ALFRED, Blackheath Park, Kent, Esq. May 10. Geare and Sons, Lincoln's-inn-fields
 HUNT, EDWIN, Colville rd, Bayswater, Artist. May 1. Hunt and Co, Pembridge villas, Bayswater
 HUGGON, WILLIAM, Leeds, Analytical Chemist. June 15. Rider, Leeds
 HUXLEY, JOHN EARLE, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Esq. May 6. Kays and Jones, New Inn, Strand
 JAMES, HENRY CHARLES, Austin Friars, Brick June 1. Johnson and Co, Austin Friars
 KINGSTON, SARAH, Bath. June 1. Finch Gray's-inn-square
 LAW, HENRY SHEPHERD, Champion Park, Camberwell, nt. June 12. Vandercom and Co, Bush lane
 LUCK, JOHN ALLEN, Halsey st, Gent. May 8. B Iton and Co, Northampton sq
 MAYHEW, SYDNEY, Walbrook, Solicitor. May 15. Blackford and Co, College-hill, Cannon st
 MONTGOMERY, CLAUDE, Salisbury, Wils. May 9. Nicholl and Co, Howard st, Strand
 MOULDER, HIRAM, Little Horton, Cork, Builder. June 1. Terry and Robinson, Bradford
 NICHOLSON, HENRY, Wandsworth, Surrey, Wine Merchant. May 15. Nicholson n d Co, Wath-upon-Deane
 REED, MARIA, Silver st, Golden sq. May 15. Belfrage and Co, Bedford row
 SHARP, WILLIAM, Sawbridgeworth, Hereford, Gent. May 1. Tyson, Ulverston
 SMITH, JOHN BUTLIN, Wilton, Northampton, Shoemaker. May 1. Cresswell, Daventry
 STEWARD, WILLIAM, Southend, Essex, Butcher. June 9. Wood and Son, Rochford
 TURNER, ANNA, Tufnell Park terrace, Upper Holloway. June 9. Johnson and Co, Austin Friars
 WEBBER, REV. FREDERICK, Penkwell Rectory, Cornwall, Clerk. May 29. Smith and Paul, Truro
 WILLS, FREDERICK, King st, James sq, Wine Merchant. May 25. Rogers, Leadenhall st
 WRAGO, RICHARD, Chesterfield, Derby, Gent. June 10. Bunting, Chesterfield
 WRIGHT, HENRY, Chichester, Upholsterer. May 13. Raper and Freeland, Chichester

[Gazette, Apr. 10.]

Court Papers.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	COURT OF APPEAL.	MASTERS OF THE ROLLS.	V.C. MALKINS.
Monday, April 19	Mr. Koe	Mr. Jackson	Mr. Farrer
Tuesday	20 Clowes	Cobby	Teesdale
Wednesday	21 Koe	Jackson	Farrer
Thursday	22 Clowes	Cobby	Teesdale
Friday	23 Koe	Jackson	Farrer
Saturday	24 Clowes	Cobby	Teesdale
	V. C. BACON.	V. C. HALL.	Mr. Justice FRY.
Monday, April 19	Mr. Latham	Mr. Pemberton	Mr. Merivale
Tuesday	20 Leach	Ward	King
Wednesday	21 Latham	Pemberton	Merivale
Thursday	22 Leach	Ward	King
Friday	23 Latham	Pemberton	Merivale
Saturday	24 Leach	Ward	King

MIDDLESEX.—EASTER SITTINGS, 1880.

LIST OF ACTIONS FOR TRIAL.

(Continued from p. 452.)

Q B 85 King and Co (Hardley, H and R) v Langton (In Person) SJ
 C P 86 Finlay (F L Soames) v Rogers (J Rae) SJ
 C P 87 Walton (Leathes and M) v Harrison (W Rawlins), SJ
 Q B 88 Tipples (G Crafter) v Budden (Stollard and W)
 Ex 89 Packer (T W Goldring) v London and St Katherine Docks Co (W M Bacon)
 Ex 90 Blad (Ingle, C and H) v The Great Eastern Ry. Co. (C A Curwood), postponed SJ
 Ex 91 Yates (Hilary and T) v N. Metropolitan Tram. Co. (H C Godfray) SJ

C P 92 Steward (Allen and Son) v Earl Lonsdale (Ellis and Ellis), postponed, SJ
 Ex 93 Crowe (Hardwick and J) v Thornton and ors (Mullens and B), SJ
 Ex 94 Milson (T Bordon) v L. and N. Western Ry. Co. (R F Roberts), SJ
 Ex 95 Llewellyn (T White and Sons) v Strangward (Sanders, H and B), SJ
 Ex 96 Pearson (W Eley) v Vincent (J V Musgrave), postponed SJ
 C P 97 Milner (F S Cavell) v Labouchere (Lewis and Lewis) SJ
 Q B 98 Capitals and Counties Bank (Nash and F) v Henty and Sons (Robinson, Preston and S), SJ
 Q B 99 Schofield (F Fearon) v Giles (A H Miller)
 C P 100 Finlay (F L Soames) v Williams and Hagen (Wontner and Sons) SJ
 C P 101 English, trustee, &c. (R Davies) v Allen (G and W Webb), com, SJ
 Q B 102 Cullwick (N Gedge) v Palmer and anr (F W Denny)
 Ex 103 Bass and Co (R H Wilkin) v Horne (Hurfurd and T)
 Q B 104 Rice (Lewis and L) v East and West India Dock Co. (Freshfields and W), stayed SJ
 Q B 105 Field, John (H J Jennings) v Great Western Ry Co (R E Nelson)
 Q B 106 Field, Henry (Same) v Same (Same)
 Q B 107 Field, senr and Wife (Same) v Same (Same)
 Q B 108 Field, junr and Wife (Same) v Same (Same)
 Q B 109 Field, by next Friend and T Field (Same) v Same (Same)
 Q B 110 The Nitro-Phosphate and Odams Chemical Manure Co (Kingsford and Co) v Roberts (Williamson, H and Co) stayed SJ
 Q B 111 Richardson (Bird, M and R) v Oldham and Canning (Mathews and S), SJ
 Ex 112 Parris (J M Mason) v Blowes (Beaumont and W) stayed
 C P 113 Charlton (Trinder and Curtis Hayward) v Bischoffsheim and anr (Freshfields and W, Elmslie and Co), Com
 C P 114 Barrett (R M Cooper) v Huston (Pritchard, R and Co)
 Q B 115 Redmond (Wontner and Sons) v Gamble (Lewis and L)
 Ex 116 J and A Blyth limd (Lyne and H) v Brown (Ashurst, M and Co), SJ
 C P 117 Gagel (H Montagu) v Rothenheim (Lumley and L) Com
 Q B 118 Luitken (H H Banyard) v Craig and Harrison (G H Finch), stayed
 Ex 119 Belli (P A Hanrott) v Lane (Foss and Legg) SJ
 Ex 120 Crawcour (Dixon, Ward and Co) v Rydon (W H Bennett), SJ
 Q B 121 Wadsworth (T D Dutton) v Bonham and Wife (Clutton and H)
 C P 122 Colcomb, Admx (W W Young) v London, Chatham, and Dover Ry (J White)
 Ex 123 Ties (Taylor and Hales) v Brook and Co (J B Lay)
 Q B 124 Eichmann (F Heritage and Co) v Bassano (Shaan, R and Co) SJ
 C P 125 Simmons (Martineau and R) v Rhodes (G H Cartnew)
 Ex 126 Rhodes (G H Cartnew) v Simmons (Martineau and R)
 C P 127 British Mutual Investment Co limd (Barnard and Co) v Williams (Stephens and S), postponed
 Ex 128 Skinner and ors (T A G Powell) v Williams (Pawle and Co) SJ
 Ex 129 Hazeldine (Duignan and S) v Dickinson (Chapple and Co)
 Ex 130 Darcey (T C Matthews) v Johnson (T Johnson)
 Ex 131 Clarke (Taylor, H and T) v Smith (Brandon and Co), postponed
 Q B 132 The Cornes and Newport Ry Co (Lambert, P and S) v Mow and ors (Stooken and J) SJ
 Ex 133 Holmes and anr (Norris, A and C) v Bousfield (J Rae) SJ
 Q B 134 Leechallas (Merriman, P and M) v Shreeve and ors (A E Tower; W P Moore), postponed, SJ
 Q B 135 Meshor (G Thompson) v Cohen (Swann and Co)
 Ex 136 Balderson (Dod and L) v Ridley (Marriott and J) SJ
 Q B 137 Mason (W H Hughes) v Aird (In Person), SJ
 Q B 138 Steer (W F Morris) v The London School Board (Gedge, K and M)
 Q B 139 Mortimer (Nash and F) v Rose (J A Rose), SJ
 Q B 140 Howell (Lucas and Son) v West and anr (Saffery and H; Hudson and Co), SJ
 Ex 141 Kemp (G H Cartnew) v Sewell (Monckton, L and Co), SJ
 C P 142 Goody and anr (A W May) v Kennedy (Boxall and B)
 Q B 143 Winn (A G Ditton) v Holloway (Barnard and Co), SJ
 Ex 144 Bridgman (Chappell and G) v London Steam Boat Co (Newman, S and H), SJ
 C P 145 Paulin (T Paulin) v Moore and anr (J C Selby)
 Ex 146 Anderson (A Price) v Nicholas (F T Rushton), SJ
 C P 147 Stenhill (Wild, B and W) v Frounce (S Price), SJ
 Q B 148 Gibbs (Beal, Webb and Co) v Fielding (G Castle)
 Q B 149 Dobrowolski (Lewis and Lewis) v Foley (Chappell, Son and Co)
 C P 150 Cannon (T J Pullen) v Johnson (Chorley, C and C)
 Ex 151 Foxwell (A Haynes and Son) v The London General Omnibus Co, limd (Harris, W and R), SJ
 Ex 152 Ortell (Miller and M) v Ward (Curtis and B), stayed
 Ex 153 Nicholls (Bolton and M) v Cox (Harris and P), SJ
 Ex 154 Nicholls (Bolton and M) v The Fanciers' Chronicle Publishing Co (Hogerson and F) SJ
 Ex 155 Ward (J Mason) v Sinfield (W Wood)
 Ex 156 Webb (Same) v Seldi (Longcroft and M)
 Ex 157 Thomas (Same) v Same (Same)
 Q B 158 Edmonds (Hudson and Co) v Harker (W Arnold)
 C P 159 Farley (T C Russell) v Edwards (Speechey and Co) SJ
 Q B 160 Hirschfeld (J Neal) v Bent (Geare and Son) SJ
 C P 161 Farmiloe (E Draper) v Birch (H C Draper), without jury
 Q B 162 Scott (H T Tiddeman) v Scott (G H Finch), stayed
 C P 163 Anderson (Surr, G and B) v Hayes (A S H Jones)
 Q B 164 Gibbs (Milne, R and M) v Clayton (Barber and F) SJ
 Ex 165 Maudie (Riekarde, M and M) v Goodspeed (Robinson, Son, and F)
 Q B 166 Nicholson's Discount Co limd (Linklater and Co) v Grueber and anr (In Person)

- Ex 167 Leekwood (M Pope) v Gonconformists' Co-operative Association Ltd (Watson, Sons and B) SJ
 CP 168 Stanbury (J S Carter) v Mathews (Syre and Co)
 CP 169 Lancraft (T C Russel) v The North Metropolitan Tramways Co Ltd (H C Godfray)
 CP 170 French (J Robinson) v Freeman (L Barnett)
 CP 171 Morgan (H W M Wetherfield) v Hopcraft and Co (J Hill; S Andrews)
 CP 172 Duke (Lucas and Coe) v Neave and Son (Peacock and G)
 CP 173 Weedon (M J Letcher) v Oughton and son (West, K, A and Co), SJ
 QB 174 Lowe (Hicklin and W) v Levinstein (H Turner)
 CP 175 Gamon (Lowless and Co) v Evans (Evans and B), SJ
 Ex 176 Ellis (Clarkson, Son and G) v Maritime Insurance Co (Norris, Allen and Co), SJ
 QB 177 Faulkner (G Presswell) v Voight (J O Meadows), SJ
 CP 178 Cummings (Nixon and C) v The Great Northern Ry Co (Nelson, Band Co) SJ
 CP 179 Allen (M S Rubinstein) v Huntley (F Heritage)
 CP 180 Dodson (J E Coxwell) v King (Blake and S)
 QB 181 Shephard and Wife (Same) v Parker (Hicklin and W)
 CP 182 Evans (Carter and B) v N Metropolitan Tramway Co (H C Godfray), SJ
 Ex 183 Moseley (Laundy and Son) v Murchison (A Kerly)
 QB 184 Sabine (Longcroft and M) v Craven (Bollit and Sons)
 QB 185 Humber (Sladen and M) v Topsham, Woodbury and Lymstone Waterworks Co (R Ballard), SJ
 CP 186 Collier (N Bennett) v Elkington (J Green)
 Ex 187 Martin (W B Brook) v Dunn (A T Hewitt) without jury
 QB 188 Burr (H Levy) v London Steamboat Co Ltd (Newman and Co)
 QB 189 Wheeler (A G Ditton) v National Insurance Corp Ltd (Jenkinson and O) SJ
 QB 189 Same (Same) v Royal Insurance Co (Same), to be tried as one cause SJ
 QB 190 Webb (M Webb and Son) v Carew (Beyfus and B) SJ
 CP 191 Rafferty (N Bennett) v Hobson (J Nicholls)
 QB 192 Burchell (M Webb and Son) v Hickinson (Wills and W)
 CP 193 French Fruit, &c., Co Ltd (J Curtis) v Price (J Davis)
 QB 194 James and son (J Raven and Co) v Kirkwood and son (Batty and W; Church, Son and G; Tilleard, G and H), SJ
 CP 195 Cheese and son (Meradith and Co) v The Kempton Park Race Course Co Ltd (Ford, L and B) SJ
 CP 196 Davenport (Campbell, R and H) v Green (W W Wynne)
 CP 197 Beer (G H Pinch) v Duval (Sandom, K and K)
 Ex 198 Cocking (M Hawkins) v Curteis and son (A Rhodes; Crowder, A and V), SJ
 QB 199 Plintham (Dalton and J) v King and son (T Durant)
 QB 200 Hime (R A Henderson) v Adams (Layton, Son and L)
 QB 201 Berridge (J W Few) v Cruden (Bolton and Co)
 Ex 202 Beale (G H Cartwright) v Sewell (Monckton, L and Co) SJ
 CP 203 Denbigh (J Holder) v Combe (T Durant)
 QB 204 Chapman (R Chapman) v Rendle (H T Dubois)
 CP 205 Whitaker and son (Radcliffe, C and M) v The Floating Swimming Baths Co, Ltd (Combe and W) SJ
 CP 206 Webber (Wilkinson and Son) v Tennant and son (Lewis and Lewis) SJ
 Ex 207 Bell (H H Mason and Son) v Campbell (Robinson, Son and E)
 CP 208 Harrap (Nixon and C) v The North Metropolitan Tram Co (H C Godfray) SJ
 Ex 209 Humby (Clarke, W and Co) v Price and son (E Peacock)
 CP 210 Boisset and son (Campbell, R and H) v Isaacson (Dod and L)
 QB 211 Betts (T R Apple) v Maas and son (W T Ricketts)
 QB 212 Bernstein (M Webb and Son) v Law (Shaw and T)
 Ex 213 Toll (E Andrew) v Whitehead (Saxton and Son)
 Ex 214 Rees (Remnant and P) v Kent (F Jones) SJ
 Ex 215 Rees (Same) v Stephens (Stephens and Co) SJ
 Ex 216 Baker (W Brewer) v Carr and son (C Bryant) SJ
 CP 217 Doolan and son (E Farman) v Austin (E D Lewis)
 CP 218 Harrison (J S Wills) v Bingley and son (S Toppin; Harper B and B)
 QB 219 Wingfield (W H Hughes) v Seringeour (Miller and M)
 QB 220 Mugliston and son (E Bastard) v Kirby and son (Hilleary and T. H C Godfray) SJ
 CP 221 Merritt (Surr, G and B) v Easter (Champion, R & P)
 CP 222 Tivy, the younger (Elborough and D) v Lillywhite (Hicklin and W)

(To be continued.)

Legal News.

At the county quarter sessions held last week at Worcester complaints were made by the justices that their proceedings should have been interrupted by the fixture of the assizes for the same week, so that the magistrates had to give up one of the courts for the trial of prisoners in order that the judge of assize might be accommodated, and Sir R. Harington moved a resolution, "That, in answering the communication of the Home Secretary as to the committal of prisoners, the clerk of the peace be directed to call attention to the inconvenience occasioned by the fixing of the spring assizes so as to clash with the quarter sessions; and to urge that the influence of the Home Office be used in order to prevent a similar inconvenience in the future; and that a similar communication be presented to the Lord Chancellor."

A correspondent of the *Times* calls attention to the system of counting votes which was successfully followed at Greenwich and the county of Middlesex. It was devised, he says, by Messrs. Shaw & Sons, of Fetter-lane, "who printed the counting-sheets I am about to refer to. The system was briefly as follows:—As soon as two presiding officers arrived with their ballot boxes, each was set to verify the other's ballot-paper account. This having been done, the clerks who were to be engaged in the counting were placed at tables in the view of the returning officer and the agents of the candidates. The contents of the boxes were then thrown down in one heap on the floor. A few hands were enough to feed the tables, where the clerks opened the papers and sorted them into bundles according to the candidates voted for, throwing out the doubtful votes, to be afterwards adjudicated upon by the returning officer. These bundles were made up in parcels of ten papers, each ten being laid across the one below, so that it could be lifted by itself. The bundles of tens were then taken to the counting table; indeed, this was being done all through, the counting going on simultaneously with the sorting. At the counting table one clerk called over the tens and two others noted them on the counting-sheets, of which there was a separate one for each candidate. These sheets were ingeniously ruled in the following manner. Each line was divided into twenty spaces. A mark was placed in each space for each ten called over, so that each complete line denoted 200 votes. A double line was drawn under each five lines so that the marks between two double lines represented 1,000 votes. As each line was completed the bundle of 200 votes was tied up separately, and in this way the number of bundles checked the correctness of the lines. After the tens were disposed of, there were only to add the few split votes and such of the doubtful papers as were allowed by the returning officer. In this way 20,000 votes may easily be counted in two hours."

On Monday last Mr. H. J. Stonor, judge of the Southwark County Court, said that in consequence of what had occurred last week in the Queen's Bench Division, he desired to make some observations, for the guidance of counsel and solicitors, as to his taking notes of evidence in important cases which came before the court. His practice had been to take notes in all jury cases where there was a right of appeal when requested to do so by either party, and in all cases in which he had reason to think it desirable. On the trial some weeks since of an issue in an action of *Harding v. Luck*, sent here by the Queen's Bench Division, he was informed by the bar before the trial commenced that it was a very simple one, namely, whether goods were supplied on three months' credit or not, and that it would depend principally on the course of dealing between the parties, which appeared by the books and accounts subsequently put in evidence. That did not seem to him to be a case in which it would be right to spend the time of the court in taking notes, and the parties were aware that he was not doing so. On a motion for a new trial, which was heard last Thursday in the Court of Queen's Bench, the Lord Chief Justice is reported to have said:—"In undisputed cases in county courts it would not be necessary for the judge to take a note, but in other cases, and especially in cases like the present, which had been sent down to the county court for trial, it was the duty and the business of the judge to take a sufficient note, and it was not necessary to show that he had been asked by either party to take it." He could hardly think that the report was correct; but if so, with very great respect to the Lord Chief Justice, he must venture to make some observations on the subject. In Best's "Treatise on Evidence," a work of the greatest authority, it was clearly laid down that "a judge only takes notes for his own private convenience. There is no law requiring him to do so." The case of *Leach v. Simpson* (5 M. & W. 309) was referred to, which fully supported the proposition in the text, and if that were true of the judges of the superior courts, it was true *à fortiori* as to the county court judges, who were created by statutes which imposed no such duty on them except in a special case. It had been over and over again decided that a suitor was not entitled to a copy of the county court judge's notes for preparing a case for appeal on points of law and evidence under the County Court Act, 1850, s. 14, and that the suitors were bound to prepare their cases from their notes taken by themselves, their legal advisers, or others, without the assistance of the judges, although, of course, if the parties differed, the judge would refer to his notes in the settlement of the case. In the County Courts Act, 1875, s. 6, a limited obligation was

laid on the judges to take notes if requested of evidence relating to points of law specially raised at the trial, clearly showing that the judge was not under any general obligation to take such notes. He concluded by referring to the great work done by county court judges, and said that if notes were taken in all cases disputed, in all the larger county courts a failure of justice would follow through arrears of work from which they had happily hitherto been free.

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

April 20.—Mr. EDWIN HULL, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Building Estate (see advertisement, April 3, p. 4.)
 April 21.—Mr. ARTHUR JACKSON, at the George Inn, Enfield, at 6 for 7 p.m., Freehold Building Land (see advertisement, April 10, p. 3.)
 April 21.—Messrs. VENTOM, BULL, & COOPER, at Ryde, at 2 for 3 p.m., Freehold Ground-rents (see advertisement, April 10, p. 3.)

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

April 15, 1880.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 95½
 Ditto for Account, 99
 Do. 3 per Cent. Reduced, 97
 New 3 per Cent., 96½
 Do. 3 per Cent., Jan. '94
 Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94
 Annuitie Jan. '80

Annuitie, April, '85, 94
 Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
 Ex Bills, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 2 dis
 Ditto, £500, No. 2 dis
 Ditto, £100 & £500, 2 dis
 Bank of England Stock, Shnt
 Ditto for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ind. Stk., 5 per C., July, '80, 104
 Ditto for Account —
 Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88, 105½
 Ditto, ditto, Certificates —
 Ditto Enforced Ppr., 4 per Cent.
 2nd Ind. Pr., 5 per C., Jan. '72

Ind. Pr. 5½ per Cent., May, 81
 Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent.
 April, '84
 Do. Do. 5 per Cent., Aug. '73
 Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000
 Ditto, ditto, under £1000

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

PIGEON.—April 3, the wife of Henry Pigeon, of No. 4, Harcourt-buildings, Temple, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.
 ROSTRON.—April 6, at Beddington, Surrey, the wife of Simpson Rostrou, of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

STEELE.—April 13, at Northbrooks, near Harlow, Essex, the wife of Adams Rivers Steele, of a daughter.

WILKES.—April 3, at Wenden House, Sutton, the wife of John Wilkes, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

FARLOW—BUBB.—April 5, at St. George's, Hanover-square, Charles Pass Farlow, of Fitzroy-road, Regent's-park, and St. Benet's-place, Gracechurch-street, solicitor, to Mary Anne Isabel, daughter of the late George Bubb, of Bond-street.

SPARLING—FLETCHER.—April 5, at St. George's Church, Campden-hill, William Sparling, M.A., of Stone-buildings, Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, to Marian, daughter of the late Charles William Fletcher, of Notting-hill square.

DEATHS.

BUCKLE.—April 2, at Monkage, York, Joseph Buckle, District Registrar of the York Registry of the Probate Division of the High Court of Justice, aged 59.

HODGE.—April 11, at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Geo. Wm. Hodge, aged 63.

NORRIS.—April 4, Robert Norris, solicitor, Liverpool, in his 50th year.

POWELL.—April 8, at No. 63, Russell-square, J. G. Henry Powell, Esq., J.P. and D.L., formerly Chairman of the Middlesex Quarter Sessions, aged 87.

TAYLOR.—April 6, at Windhill, Bishop's Stortford, John Dobede Taylor, solicitor, in his 68th year.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Bankruptcy.

FRIDAY, April 9, 1880.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
 To Surrender in London.

Bass, James, Brecknock crescent, Camden Town, Hotel Proprietor. Pet Apr 6. Murray. Apr 23 at 11
 To Surrender in the Country.
 Alston, Stephen John Henry, Faversham, Kent, Outfitter. Pet Apr 6. Parley. Canterbury, Apr 30 at 2
 Cook, Felix, Leeds, Fruit and Sugar Merchant. Pet Apr 6. Marshall. Leeds, Apr 25 at 11

Day, Stephen, Isle of Ely, Cambridge, Grocer. Pet Apr 5. Eaden. Cambridge, Apr 20 at 1
 Gardner, Thomas William, Deddington, Oxford, Farmer. Pet Apr 3. Bishop. Oxford, Apr 24 at 12.30
 Green, George William, Devonport, Lodging house keeper. Pet Apr 6. Edmonds. East Stonchouse, Apr 23 at 12
 Hunt, Philip, Bradford, York, Toy and Fancy Dealer. Pet Apr 3. Robinson. Bradford, Apr 23 at 12
 Parnaby, John, Sunnington, York, Corn Miller. Pet Apr 5. Woodall. Scarborough, Apr 21 at 3
 Sanders, Henry, Shanklin, Isle of Wight, Builder. Pet Apr 3. Blake. Newport, Apr 21 at 11
 Thompson, John, Sheffield, Steel Manufacturer. Pet Apr 1. Rodgers. Sheffield, Apr 21 at 1.30
 Thompson, Joseph, Reifield, Gloucester, Builder. Pet Apr 7. Harley. Bristol, Apr 23 at 2
 Woodburn, Edward, Barrow-in-Furness, Auctioneer. Pet Apr 7. Postlethwaite. Ulverston, Apr 23 at 12

TUESDAY, April 13, 1880.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
 To Surrender in London.

Atkins, John, Brunswick pl, City rd, Tobacco Merchant. Pet Mar 16. Murray. Apr 20 at 11.30
 Sedger, Horace, Moorgate, Auctioneer. Pet Apr 9. Brougham. Apr 28 at 11.30
 To Surrender in the Country.
 Davies, William, Pwll Wain, nr Pontypridd, Glamorgan, Colliery Proprietor. Pet Apr 9. Spickett. Pontypridd, Apr 26 at 12
 Gibbons, James, Stockton-on-Tees, Builder. Pet Apr 1. Crosby. Stockton-on-Tees, Apr 28 at 2.30
 Heapy, Frederick Edmund, Salford, Lancaster, Baker. Pet Apr 8. Hulton. Salford, Apr 28 at 11
 Mason, Henry, Bristol, Grocer. Pet Apr 8. Harley. Bristol, Apr 28 at 2
 Morris, Henry, Bradford, York, Eating house keeper. Pet Apr 9. Robinson. Bradford, Apr 27 at 12
 Suter, Matthew, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Tea Dealer. Pet Apr 10. Daggett. Newcastle, Apr 26 at 11

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, April 9, 1880.

Hoare, Wilson Noble, Braishfield, Southampton, Farmer. Apr 7
 TUESDAY, April 13, 1880.
 Aldons, John Thomas, Lee, Kent, Ironmonger. Apr 10
 Bland, David, Blackheath, Kent, Builder. Apr 9

Liquidations by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, April 9, 1880.

Addison, Herbert Fisher, Hastings, Grocer. Apr 21 at 12 at offices of Savery and Chambers, Trinity st, Hastings
 Albery, Frank, Forest Gate, Essex, Commercial Traveller. Apr 24 at 4 at the Belladuna villa, Barthill rd, Sutton
 Alderson, George, Hingham, Norwich, Bricklayer. Apr 19 at 10.30 at offices of Stanley, Bank plain, Norwich
 Allen, Thomas, Duxford, Cambridge, Grocer. Apr 22 at 12 at offices of Ellison and Co, Alexandra st, Petty Cury, Cambridge
 Attrill, George Frederick, Southsea, Hants, Grocer. Apr 26 at 3 at offices of Edmonds and Co, St James' st, Portsea
 Barker, Charles Henry, Fontefract, York, Whitesmith. Apr 22 at 12 at offices of Richards, Market place, Pontefract
 Bassett, Samuel, Manchester, Contractor. Apr 22 at 3 at offices of Heath and Sons, Swan st, Manchester
 Barratt, Thomas, Moseley, near Birmingham, out of business. Apr 20 at 3 at offices of Parry, Bennet's hill, Birmingham
 Bashford, James, Nantwich, Cheshire, Provision Dealer. Apr 16 at 11 at the Albert chambers, Church side, Crewe. Poulton, Crewe
 Beard, George, Hadfield, Derby, Slater. Apr 21 at 3 at offices of Johnston, Vernon st, Stockport
 Beasley, Henry, Reading, Berks, Wholesale Confectioner. Apr 22 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Friar st, Reading. Beale and Martin, Reading
 Bellamy, Emanuel, Bulwell, Nottingham, Grocer. Apr 20 at 3 at offices of Bright, Town Club chambers, Wheeler gate, Nottingham
 Boucher, John Clent, Birmingham, Tailor. Apr 21 at 3 at offices of Wright and Marshall, Townhall chambers, New st, Birmingham
 Brown, William Lax Cave, Manchester, India Rubber Manufacturer. Apr 27 at 3 at 12, Piccadilly, Manchester. Stead, Manchester
 Budden, Frederick Aiton, Bridport, Dorset, Grocer. Apr 22 at 3 at offices of Lock, High West st, Dorchester
 Bull, George, Dorell mews, Crown rd, Farrier. Apr 28 at 3 at offices of Fowler, Borough High st, Southwark
 Butler, Thomas Fisher, Widnes, Lancaster, Joiner. Apr 27 at 3 at the Grapes Hotel, Lime st, Liverpool. Davies and Co, Warrington
 Buxton, Charles, Liverpool, Builder. Apr 19 at 12 at offices of Benson and Carpenter, Bank chambers, Corn st, Bristol
 Candy, Abraham, Guildford st, Russell sq, out of business. Apr 24 at 12 at offices of Eude and Brown, High Holborn
 Challis, Arthur William, and Arthur Thomas Tebbutt, Peckham, Builders. Apr 28 at 2 at offices of Moss, Gracechurch st
 Chapman, Robert, Wild's rents, Bermondsey, Beer Retailer. Apr 21 at 4 at offices of Morphet and Hanson, King st, Cheapside, Terry, King st, Cheapside
 Chapple, Alfred Henry, Sheffield, Grocer. Apr 21 at 2 at offices of Taylor, Norfolk row, Sheffield
 Clark, Robert, Walworth rd, Lambeth, Fishmonger. Apr 29 at 3 at offices of Wedderburne, Metropolitan chambers, Broad st
 Clarke, Edward, Old Ford rd, India Rubber Worker. Apr 29 at 3 at offices of Briant, Winchester house, Old Broad st
 Clarke, James William, Mitcham, Surrey, Corn Merchant. Apr 21 at 3 at offices of Harcourt, Moorgate st
 Cripps, William, Eynsham, Oxford, Saddler. Apr 29 at 12 at offices of Eickerton, St Michael's chambers, Ship st
 Davis, Charles, Tynynrods, Glamorgan, Rail Inspector. Apr 19 at 1 at offices of Simons and Fiew, Church st, Merthyr Tydfil

Dickinson, Robert, Leeds, Provision Merchant. Apr 22 at 3.30 at offices of Roose and Price, North John st, Liverpool. Adheshaw and Warburton

Dorrell, Thomas, Bishampton, Worcester, Farmer. Apr 19 at 11 at offices of Hill, Pierpoint st, Worcester

Drew, Joseph, Ross, Hereford, Innkeeper. Apr 21 at 3 at the Green Dragon Hotel, Hereford. Gibbs and Llewellyn, Newport

Duckett, James, Lincoln, Licensed Victualler. Apr 26 at 12 at offices of Ward, Silver st, Lincoln

Dunnett, Frederick Henry, Bury St Edmunds, Bootseller. Apr 29 at 12 at offices of Partridge and Greene, Crown st, Bury St Edmunds

Emery, Edwin, Ditchling, Sussex, Grocer. Apr 22 at 3 at offices of Nye, South st, Brighton

Eyre, Samuel, Keighley, York, Coal Merchant. Apr 23 at 3 at offices of Neill, Kirkcaldy, Bradford

Fitch, Frederick, Deal, Kent, Grocer. Apr 22 at 12 at the Creditors' Association, Arthur at East, Mercer and Co

Garth, Benjamin, Batley, York, Tailor. Apr 23 at 10.30 at offices of Ridgway and Ridgway, Wellington st, Batley

Geary, Edwin, Belgrave, Leicester, out of business. Apr 22 at 3 offices of the Trade Protection Society, New st, Leicester. Miles and Co

Golding, Alfred, Lye, Worcester, Bucket Maker. Apr 21 at 11 at offices of Wall, High st, Stourbridge

Gwilliam, Edin, Barrow-in-Furness, Seedman. Apr 21 at 11 at the Trevelyan Temperance Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness. Sims, Barrow-in-Furness

Halkett, Frederick John Collie, West Brighton, Sussex, Lieutenant-Colonel of Militia. May 5 at 3 at offices of Childley, Old Jury

Hardwick, Edmund Faunce, Littlehampton, Sussex, Solicitor. Apr 17 at 11 at the Chamber of Commerce, Chichester. Goodman, Brighton

Harris, Joseph, Wigton, Cumberland, Grocer. Apr 23 at 11, at offices of Lawson, King's Arms-lane, Wigton

Harris, James, Blackburn, Lancashire, Builder. Apr 22 at 3 at offices of Scott, Victoria st, Blackburn

Langton, Thomas, Clement's lane, Timber Agent. Apr 20 at 3 at offices of Rae, Mincing lane

Lanyon, Charles, Kenwyn, Cornwall, Butcher. Apr 21 at 3 at offices of Paul, Quay st, Truro

Lewis, Daniel, South Marston, Wilts, Baker. Apr 21 at 2 at the Queen's Arms Hotel, New Swindon. Foreman, Swindon

Loew, John, Jnr, Norton, Worcester, out of business. Apr 27 at 12 at offices of Corbett, the Grocers, Worcester

Libbeter, William Henry, Alderman st, Somer's Town, Tobaccoist. Apr 22 at 3 at 133; Holborn

Lloyd, James, Bilston, Stafford, General Merchant. Apr 24 at 11 at the Bull's Head Inn, High st, Bilston. Fellows, Bilston

Lonsdale, William, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Grocer. Apr 23 at 11.30 at offices of Prond, Market pl, Bi-hp Auckland

Lovell, Samuel, Taunton, Somerset, Boot Dealer. Apr 23 at 12 at offices of Reeves, Mary st, Taunton

Luddicke, Hermann, Gerrard st, Soho, Hotel Keeper. Apr 23 at 3 at offices of Purkes, Queen Victoria st

Manning, William Lockwood, Depden, Suffolk, Blacksmith. Apr 21 at 12 at the Guildhall, Bury St Edmunds. Gross, Bury St Edmunds

Marshall, George, Mexborough, York, Boot Dealer. Apr 22 at 3 at offices of Nicholson and Co, East parade, Sheffield. Busdekin and Co

Middlewood, Thomas, Cottingham, York, Builder. Apr 19 at 3 at No. 9, Seale lane, Kingston-upon-Hull. Salmon

Mills, Richard, Tipton, Stafford, Publican. Apr 20 at 3 at offices of Sheldon, High st, Wednesbury

Mitchell, Charles William, Huddersfield, Merchant. Apr 21 at 11 at offices of Whitley, New st, Huddersfield

Moore, Edward, Freeman's ct, Cheshire, Licensed Victualler. Apr 27 at 12 at offices of Swaine, King st, Cheshire

Moore, John James, Wolverhampton, Carpenter. Apr 30 at 3 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Moss, Samuel Elias, Fosse st, Exchamware Agent. May 3 at 2 at offices of Blackford and Co, College hill

Mountain, Charles George, Birmingham, Engineer. Apr 23 at 19 at Grand Hotel, Colmore row, Birmingham. Sanders and Co, Birmingham

Nutman, George Robert, Leicester, Wholesale Druggist. Apr 23 at 3 at offices of Oswon and Dickinson, Friar lane, Leicester

Oliver, Charles, Dorchester, Boot and Shoe Maker. April 22 at 3 at Junction Hotel, Dorchester. Burnett, Dorchester

Park, Robert, Swansea, Livery Stable Keeper. Apr 17 at 3 at offices of Jelliffe, Prospect pl, Swansea

Parsonage, John, Boughton, Chester, Provision Dealer. Apr 23 at 3 at offices of Mason, Bridge st row East, Chester

Phillips, Henry John, Kingsbury Episcopi, Somerset, Clerk in Holy Orders. Apr 22 at 1, at Grand Hotel, Broad st, Bristol. Davies, Sherborne

Pickering, Richard, Kingston-upon-Hull, Cooper. Apr 16 at 3 at offices of Chambers, Seale lane, Kingston-upon-Hull

Pickford, James John Ferguson, Penarth, Glamorgan, Boot and Shoe Maker. Apr 29 at 11 at offices of Morgan and Scott, High st, Cardiff

Ramshaw, Joseph, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Licensed Victualler. Apr 23 at 11 at offices of Montgomery, Blackett st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Roberts, James, Tipton, Stafford, Boot Manufacturer. Apr 21 at 11 at offices of Travis, Church lane, Tipton

Roith, Joseph William, Chesterfield, Derby, Butcher. Apr 21 at 11 at offices of Jones and Middleton, Gluman gate, Chesterfield

Sanders, Thomas, Wolverhampton, Grocer. Apr 22 at 3 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Short, Thomas, Alern rd, Eekham, Grocer. Apr 26 at 3 at offices of Pae, Queen st, Cheshire

Sills, John Charles, Middlesborough, York, Tailor. Apr 22 at 3 at offices of Learoyd and Co, Buxton rd, Huddersfield

Smith, William, Colleshill, Warwick, Grocer. Apr 22 at 11 at offices of Blewitt, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Smith, William Miller, Middleton rd, Kingsland rd, Dealer in Tobacco-nists' Fancy Goods. Apr 20 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane

South, John, Westbury, Salop, Butcher. Apr 21 at 11 at offices of Morris and Sons, Shrewsbury

Stanton, William, Ipswich, Nut and Rivet Manufacturer. Apr 24 at 11 at offices of Valliamy, Tower st, Ipswich

Steventon, Richard, Over, Chester, Boot Manufacturer. Apr 21 at 11 at the Royal Hotel, Crewe. Cooke, Middlewich

Stoneman, James, Russell pl, Bermondsey, Leather Merchant. Apr 19 at 11 at the Bridge House Hotel, Southwark. Biggden, Wall st, Hackney

Turner, Stephen, Campbell buildings, Peckham, Draper. Apr 27 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Priehard, Bedford row

Upton, John Coleman, Tamworth, Warwick, Draper. Apr 23 at 3 at offices of Nevill and Atkins, Colehill, Tamworth

Vinson, Charles, Aldershot, Hants, Corn Merchant. Apr 27 at 3 at the Bosh Hotel, Farnham. Knight and Ward, Farnham

Wade, Thomas, Wrenbury, Chester, Farmer. Apr 21 at 2.30 at the Royal Hotel, Crewe. Bridgman and Co, Chester

Waters, Charles, Eastbourne, Farmer. Apr 21 at 2 at the Sussex Hotel, Eastbourne. Langham, Uckfield

Wheeldon, William George, Ilkeston, Derby, Lace Maker. Apr 21 at 11 at offices of Stevenson, Weekday cross, Nottingham

Woolley, William Brandreth, Falkingham, Lincoln, Butcher. Apr 19 at 12 at offices of Law, St Mary's pl, Stamford

Wyles, Lawrence, St Ives, Huntingdon, Ironmonger. Apr 16 at the Angel Hotel, Peterborough, in lieu of the place originally named

TUESDAY, APR 13, 1880.

Atkinson, Alexander, Nottingham, Dealer in Boots. Apr 27 at 3 at offices of Lees, Severn chambers, Middle pavement, Nottingham

Barry, George, Shepton Maller, Somerset, Blacksmith. Apr 23 at 2 at Hare and Hounds Hotel, Shepton Maller. Hobbs, Jun, Wells

Bird, Edwin, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Leicester, Newsagent. Apr 26 at 12 at offices of Dewes and Musson, Market st, Ashby-de-la-Zouch

Bishop, John, Gannow Green, near Halesowen, Worcester, Farmer. Apr 29 at 11 at offices of Bower, Price and Son, Paradise st, Birmingham

Bradley, Thomas William, Knight Ridr st, Doctors Commons, Restaurant Proprietor. Apr 22 at 2 at Mason's Hall Tavern, Mason's Avenue, Basinghall st. Gregory, Cannon at

Brazier, William, Latimer rd, Notting hill, Joiner. Apr 30 at 3 at offices of Fowler, Borough High st

Brown, Edwin Henry, Collingwood terrace, Battersea, Draper. Apr 26 at 11 at offices of Rexworthy, Cheshire

Brown, Francis Charles, Wellington, Somerset, Boot Dealer. Apr 26 at 11 at offices of Reed and Coos, Paul st, Taunton

Brownson, John, Holyhurne, Derby, Farmer. Apr 29 at 12.30 at offices of Cooper and Chawner, Uttoketer

Burgess, John James, Suffolk pl, Wandsworth, Greengrocer's Manager. Apr 27 at 3 at offices of Groat, St Swithin's lane

Clapp, Benjamin Thomas, Morice Town, Stoke Damerel, Devon, Licensed Victualler. Apr 26 at 12 at offices of Hartnoll, Charlotte st, Morice Town

Clark, Leonard, Long Preston, York, Grocer. Apr 27 at 3 at the Ship Hotel, Skipton. P-got, Skipton

Clarke, Joseph, Whitington, Derby, Collier. Apr 23 at 3 at offices of Cutis, Market Hall chambers, Chesterfield

Cockburn, Harvey Charles, Wilton rd, Fimlico, Jeweller. Apr 26 at 3 at 25, Wilton rd. Inderwick, Bedford row

Coop, Robert Henry, Oldham, Lancashire, Undertaker. Apr 27 at 3 at the Mitre Hote, Manchester. Clegg, Oldham

Coward, Rowland, Sheffield, Joiner. Apr 24 at 10.30 at offices of Webster and Styring, Hartshead, Sheffield

Coddiford, Edward, Plymouth, out of business. Apr 22 at 12 at offices of Pearse, Princess sq, Plymouth

Calverhouse, William, Lincoln, Grocer. Apr 26 at 3 at offices of Williams, Silver st, Lincoln

Davies, Emma, Ferrydyke, Carmarthen, Publican. Apr 22 at 11 at offices of Morris, Quay st, Carmarthen

Davies, John, Upper st, Islington, Milliner. Apr 26 at 3 at offices of Cooper and Co, King's Arms yard

Deitz, George, Bradford, York, Pork Butcher. Apr 26 at 3 at offices of Crowther, Kensington st, Bradford

Dodsworth, Thomas, Rufforth, York, Farmer. Apr 23 at 3 at offices of Crum, Stonegate

Durrans, Richard, Doncaster, York, Licensed Victualler. Apr 26 at 2 at the Rinder Hotel, Doncaster. Learoyd and Co

Edwardes, John Brittle, Huddersfield, Commission Agent. Apr 25 at 11 at offices of Ramsden and Co, John William st, Huddersfield

Evans, Frederick William, Barking, Essex, Baker. Apr 23 at 11 at offices of Mackreth, New Broad st

Farrin, Johnson, High Cro-s, Tottenham, Butcher. Apr 28 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane

Faulkner, William, Abbots Bromley, Staff rd, Farmer. Apr 26 at 12.30 at offices of Cooper and Chawner, Uttoketer

Field, William, Preston, Hertford, Farmer. April 21 at 3 at offices of Times, Portmill lane, Hitchin

Fowler, William, Oldham, Lancashire, Butcher. Apr 27 at 2 at Mitre Hotel, Cathedral gates, Manchester. Clegg, Oldham

Gayford, Frederick, Rickmansworth, Herts, Farmer. Apr 22 at 3 at 1, Gresham bldgs, Basinghall st. Chapman and Bondle

Gelder, Job, and Richard Iredale, Halifax, Bakers. Apr 26 at 11 at office of Rhodes, Horton st, Halifax

Gent, James, Tonbridge, Kent, Tailor. Apr 14 at 10.30 at offices of Briggs, Great James st, B-diord row

Gibson, John, Chapeltown, near Sheffield, Druggist. Apr 27 at 12 at Cutlers' Hall, Church st, Sheffield. Rodgers and Co, Sheffield

Gilder, William, Biggleswade, Bedford, Baker. Apr 27 at 3 at Swan Hotel, Biggleswade. Conquest and Clarke, Bedford

Gilman, Charles, Park rd, Clapham, Ironmonger. May 5 at 11 at the Spread Eagle Hotel, High st, Wandsworth. Jones, High st, Wandsworth

Giffos, Edward, Hasland, Derby, Grocer. Apr 26 at 3 at offices of Jones and Middleton, Gluman gate, Chesterfield

Goodwin, William, Percy circus, King's Cross rd, out of business. Apr 22 at 2 at the Midland Hotel, Derby. Harris, Finsbury circus

Gough, Thomas, East Knoyle, Wilts, of no business. Apr 26 at 1 at the Bath Arms Hotel, Warminster. Robins, Shaftesbury

Greenwood, John, Church Fenton, York, Farmer. Apr 27 at 1 at offices of Russell, Lendal, York

Griffiths, Joseph, Wrexham, Denbigh, Chemist. Apr 29 at 2 at the Feathers Hotel, Clayton sq, Liverpool. Jones, Wrexham

Gorman, Charles William, Southampton, Confectioner. Apr 22 at 3 at offices of Watts, High st, Southampton
 Halsway, James, Sedburgh, York. Tailor. Apr 27 at 11 at the Commercial Inn, Kendal. Cragg, Sedburgh
 Harris, Charles Butler, Streatley, Bedford, Clerk in Holy Orders. Apr 30 at 3 at the George Hotel, Luton. Benning and Sons, Dunstable
 Harrison, Peter, Hen-du-l'angoed, Beaumaris, Anglesey, Coal Merchant. Apr 22 at 3 at offices of Ashton and Woods, Horsemarket st, Warrington
 Hartley, William Stoford, Birmingham, Picture Dealer. Apr 23 at 10.30 at offices of East, Temple st, Birmingham
 Hawley, Thomas, Ryther, York, Blacksmith. Apr 24 at 1 at the Woodman Inn, Ryther, nr Tadcaster. Billing, Leeds
 Heath, James, Somercoates, Derby, Grocer. Apr 29 at 3 at the Bell Hotel, Sadler gate, Derby. Hextall, Derby
 Heeketh, John, Blackley, nr Manchester, Farmer. Apr 30 at 4 at offices of Rowley, Brown st, Manchester
 Hindson, John, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler. Apr 26 at 12 at offices of Francis and Collins, Harrington st, Liverpool
 Holder, Thomas, Hansworth, Stafford, Builder. Apr 29 at 3 at offices of Saunders and Brachbury, Temple row, Birmingham
 Horner, Henry, Plymouth, Painter. Apr 23 at 11 at offices of Square, George st, Plymouth
 Hughes, Jane, Birmingham, School Proprietress. Apr 29 at 3 at offices of Dale and Vachell, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
 Hugill, William, sen, and William Hugill, jun, Kirkby Moorside, York, Farmers. Apr 27 at 10.30 at offices of Harrison, Kirkby Moorside
 Huntley, Robert, Felling Shore, Durham, Beerhouse Keeper. Apr 29 at 11 at offices of Keenlyside and Co, Grainger st West, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Jacques, James William, Westhorpe, Leicester, Licensed Victualler. Apr 26 at 12 at offices of Fowler and Co, Grey Friars chambers, Friar lane, Leicester
 Jeffries, Henry, Bridgewater, Somerset, Farmer. Apr 29 at 12 at offices of Reed and Cook, King sq, Bridgewater
 Jenkins, William, Barbourne, Worcester, Builder. Apr 26 at 11 at offices of Thompson and Taylor, Pierpoint st, Worcester
 Johnson, Daniel, Kidderminster, Worcester, Baker. Apr 26 at 3 at offices of Thurstfield, Swan st, Kidderminster
 Joynar, George William, Birmingham, out of business. Apr 26 at 2 at offices of Burton, Union passage, Birmingham
 Large, James Francis, Epsilwood, Somerset, Butcher. Apr 29 at 2 at offices of Clifton and Carter, Broad st, Bristol
 Lark, Lewis Cower, Hanley, Stafford, out of business. Apr 23 at 11 at Vine Inn, Stafford. Ashmall, Hanley
 Lindfield, John, Slaughtam, Sussex, Blacksmith. Apr 29 at 4 at Crown Hotel, Horsham. Cotoching, Horsham
 McCarthy, Walter Emilius, Cockspur st, Charing cross, Architect. May 5 at 2 at King's Arms Hotel, Folkestone. Ashley and Son, Frederick's pl, Old Jewry
 Martin, Charles, Westbury-on-Severn, Gloucester, Miller. Apr 20 at 12 at offices of Parker, Newnham
 Martin, George, St John st rd, Clerkenwell, Fraterer. Apr 28 at 11 at offices of Wright and Law, High Holborn
 McCall, James, Leicester, Draper. Apr 26 at 3 at offices of Wright and Hincks, Belvoir st, Leicester
 McQuie, James, Stotterdon, Salp, Forester. Apr 22 at 2.30 at offices of Miller and Co, Church st, Kidderminster
 Midghall, Richard, Preston, Lancashire, Builder. May 5 at 11 at offices of Thompson and Craven, Lune st, Preston
 Oates, Robert John, Oriental st, East India rd, Trinity House Pilot. Apr 29 at 2 at offices of Moss, Gracechurch st
 Odiam, Henry, Brisham, Devon, Cabinet Maker. Apr 23 at 1 at Rougemont Hotel, Exeter. Curtis, East Stonehouse
 Fearman, James, Birmingham, Corn Merchant. Apr 26 at 3 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Purchas, Charles Sumpton, Wakefield, Tobaccoconist. Apr 26 at 3 at offices of Lodge, Park row, Leeds
 Rayley, George, Fulborough, Sussex, Grocer. Apr 30 at 1 at Swan Hotel, Fulborough. Downer, Petworth
 Reddish, Edward, Stowmarket, Suffolk, Bootmaker. May 3 at 12 at offices of Fox, Ipswich st, Stowmarket. Gudgeon
 Reed, James, Carlisle, Milliner. Apr 24 at 4 at offices of Johnson, Scotch st, Carlisle
 Reid, John, Craven rd, Bayswater, Baker. May 5 at 12 at offices of Chandler and Co, Coleman st. Scott, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st
 Rimmer, Robert, Chesterfield, Derby, Hotel keeper. Apr 26 at 12 at offices of Gratton and Marsden, Knifesmith gate, Chesterfield
 Roberts, Edwin, St James rd, Islington, Pawnbroker. Apr 28 at 3 at offices of Nevett, Warwick ct, Gray's inn
 Rogers, Robert, Bristol, out of business. Apr 27 at 3 at offices of Tricks and Co, Nicholas st, Bristol. Jacques, Bristol
 Rookes, Henry, Brisham, Devon, Cabinet Maker. Apr 23 at 1 at Rougemont Hotel, Exeter. Curtis, East Stonehouse
 Shapley, Frederick John, Exeter, Confectioner. Apr 28 at 3.30 at the Craven Hotel, Craven st, Strand. Friend, Exeter
 Silverstone, Michael, Grey Eagle st, Spitalfields, Hat Manufacturer. Apr 29 at 3 at offices of Podmore and Harte, Moorgate st
 Smith, Ellen, Birmingham, Undertaker. Apr 22 at 10.30 at offices of East, Temple st, Birmingham
 Smith, James, Sedgley, Stafford, Grocer. Apr 27 at 11 at the Saracens Head Hotel, Stone rd, Dudley. Tinsley, Dudley
 Smith, John Edwin, Bradford, Wholesmith. Apr 23 at 4 at offices of Baker, Commercial Bank buildings, Bradford
 Strachan, James, Llanvethorne, Monmouth, Farmer. Apr 22 at 3 at offices of Browne, Lion st, Abergavenny
 Tallady, George, Bury St Edmunds, Boot and Shoe Maker. Apr 29 at 12 at the Guildhall, Bury St Edmunds. Salmon and Son, Bury St Edmunds
 Ward, George, Dulwich, Surrey, Builder. Apr 29 at 2 at the Cannon st Hotel, Cannon st. Elmole and Co, Leadenhall st
 Warner, Thomas Woodcock, Great Dunmow, Essex, Ironmonger. Apr 29 at 1 at the Auction Mart, Tokenhouse yard, Blyth, Chelmsford
 Wells, John, St Stephen's rd, Bow, General Dealer. Apr 28 at 12 at offices of Moss, Gracechurch st

White, Robert Gunn, Stockport, Chester, Tobaccoconist. Apr 26 at 3 at offices of Leigh, Brown st, Manchester
 Williams, Andrew Nicholas, North Shields, Glass Dealer. Apr 26 at 3 at offices of Smith, Cruden st, North Shields
 Williams, George, Southampton, Baker. Apr 22 at 2 at offices of Watts, High st, Southampton
 Woolston, Richard, Leicester, Shoe Manufacturer. Apr 28 at 3 at offices of Shires, Market st, Leicester

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas thickened yet weakened with starch, &c., and is REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOATINA A LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tin packets at 1s. 6d., 3s., 6s. 6d., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors,

H. SCHWEITZER & CO., 10, Adam-street, London, W.C.

PAINLESS DENTISTRY.

MR. G. H. JONES,

SURGEON DENTIST,

57, GREAT RUSSELL-STREET, BLOOMSBURY

(Immediately opposite the British Museum),

Will be glad to forward his new Pamphlet gratis and post-free, which explains the only perfectly painless system of adapting ARTIFICIAL TEETH (protected by Her Majesty's Royal Letters Patent), which have obtained five Prize Medals, London 1862, Paris 1867, Philadelphia 1876, Vienna 1873, and New York 1853.—Consultation daily free.

EDE AND SON

ROBE



MAKERS

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS, &c

ESTABLISHED 1649.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

TO SOLICITORS and OTHERS.—WANTED,

£6,000 on Mortgage at 5 per cent. on small weekly properties, in sums of about £1,000 each. No fees will be paid unless the money is advanced.—Address, B. 13, at C. H. May & Co.'s General Advertising Office, 75, Gracechurch-street.

TO TRUSTEES.—A Safe Investment for £3,600.

A very snug little farm of 42 acres with good homestead, buildings, &c. Situated about 5 miles from Exeter and let to a very respectable tenant at a clear annual rent of £130.—Apply, Mr. S. R. Bury, Estate Agent, 75, Cheapside, E.C.

MORTGAGE Investments Required for £20,000;

two sums of £10,000; a sum of £3,000 non-invested but which will be released in a few months, and various smaller amounts.—Send particulars to Mr. S. R. Bury, Investment Office, 75, Cheapside, E.C.

REVERSIONS and LIFE POLICIES.—The Sale

or Mortgage of these Securities quickly negotiated by Mr. S. R. Bury, 75, Cheapside, E.C.

LIFE INTERESTS, ANNUITIES, and REVER-

SIONS, for Sale or Mortgage.—Send particulars to HAZELL & GOLDBRING, 22, Theobald's-road, W.C.

LAW.—PARTNERSHIP, or SUCCESSION,

WANTED, by a Solicitor (age 28), of good social position, who is a good Conveyancer, thoroughly conversant with general business, including the working of public appointments, and accustomed to advise a bench of magistrates.—Address, G. H., care of Mr. Walter, Advertising Agent, 4, Bell-yard, Temple Bar,